

Gc
974.402
W31f

Gc
974.402
W31f
1204343

GENEALOGY COLLECTION



ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01068 8692



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015



AN

HISTORICAL SKETCH

OF

W A T E R T O W N,

IN MASSACHUSETTS,

FROM THE

FIRST SETTLEMENT OF THE TOWN

TO

THE CLOSE OF ITS SECOND CENTURY.

By CONVERS FRANCIS,

CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER OF WATERTOWN.

CAMBRIDGE:

E. W. METCALF AND COMPANY.

M DCCC XXX.

NOTICE.

SUCH parts of the following narrative, as were suited to the purposes of a public occasion, were contained in an Address, delivered by the writer, on the 17th of September, 1830, in commemoration of the close of the Second Century of the town. The whole is now published in a regular historical form, following the order of time. It is respectfully inscribed to the inhabitants of Watertown, for whose use chiefly it was composed.

C. F.

HISTORY OF WATERTOWN.

1204343

207.4
mill
\$7.00

WE live at a period of patriotic remembrances. It has become the fashion of the times to gather up memorials of the fathers of New England. A more general interest, than ever before, is felt in tracing their footsteps, and in searching their records. This feeling is one of the manifestations of the pleasure we naturally find in the exercise of that wonderful power of retrospection, which enables us almost to antedate our lives, to merge the distinctions of time in a sense of fellowship with the past, to overleap the barriers of years and centuries, and to add to the short span of our own days the days of those who have gone before us. But besides this, it is our good fortune, that the ties of association with the memory of our ancestors are, in a remarkable degree, minutely local. Not only is their general history, in its whole extent, so recent, comparatively, that we are able to trace it in clear and distinct lines quite up to its commencement, without being lost in the shadowy regions of conjecture and fable, but we can identify the men and their doings with the smallest subdivisions of the republic, with our towns and hamlets. Our whole land, in all its youthful strength and vast resources, is a monument to the Pilgrims, who, when they began their cheerless work, would have deemed it the wildest dream of romance, had they been told of the mighty edifice which was to be reared on their labors, and who toiled and suffered with strong patience, and

with a trust in God that never wavered. But, below these magnificent views, there are other reminiscences, which, if they have no grandeur, are not without interest and value. With the names and the deeds of our fathers we can associate the green fields and the beautiful groves of our villages, the virtues and the enjoyments of an industrious neighbourhood, the schools at which our children seek instruction, and the sanctuaries where we call upon the name of our God. Our recollections become domesticated feelings, and have a lodgement among our most familiar possessions. Our daily walks seem almost overshadowed by the presence of a past generation; for their footsteps have not long disappeared from the places, which, in the midst of the cares and pleasures of common life, we recognise and love as our homes. To cherish and perpetuate some of these village recollections of our fathers, is the purpose of the following narrative.

The character of the Puritans has of late been a favorite topic, both among ourselves and in England. Its peculiarities have been traced with felicitous skill, and its merits portrayed with powerful eloquence, by some of the most gifted writers of our times. The men of this generation stand in a position favorable for doing justice to its claims. We are sufficiently remote from the excitement, in which the Puritans lived and acted, to estimate fairly their excellencies and errors, the value of their labors, and the consequences of their principles. It cannot be a matter of wonder, that two centuries ago they should have been the objects of bitter sarcasm and abusive reproach, when we consider that their faults were precisely such, as would naturally be met with the most unsparing hostility, and that they themselves in some cases manifested but little forbearance in applying epithets of infamy to their adversaries. The nature of the contest, in which they were so deeply concerned, was adapted to bring out the sharp, stern, uncompromis-

ing qualities of human character, to confound a zeal for trifles with a zeal for essential principles, and sometimes to engage the aid of unholy passions in a holy cause. We can hardly be much surprised, therefore, at the foul asperity with which Parker, Whitgift, Dugdale, and others of that day, spoke or wrote of the Puritans, — the poor and pitiful abuse which they heaped upon men, who were struggling for sacred rights against the strong arm of power. We may not conceal or deny their faults; but, at the same time, we may not forget the provocations they endured. We may not forget the iniquitous proceedings of the High Commission and the Star Chamber, those disgraceful instruments of cruel persecution, which brought their terrors to bear on the crimes of not wearing a white surplice, of not baptizing with a cross, and of refusing to kneel at the sacrament. We cannot but remember, that the Puritans were goaded, oppressed, and held in contempt under Elizabeth, who was just as much a Protestant as was necessary to make herself a pope, and no more; that their hopes of protection were grievously disappointed by James, that notable professor of kingcraft, who had said, when in Scotland, — “As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil said mass in English, — they want nothing of the mass but the liftings,” — but to whom the possession of the sceptre suddenly taught the bad lessons of intolerance towards all who would not conform to that same kirk; that, under the first Charles, measures were dealt to them, scarcely milder than those of the Inquisition; and that the second Charles paved the way to his restoration with promises to them, which he never meant to keep. These and similar circumstances rise to our remembrance, when we are told of their hard and offensive qualities; and we are disposed to pardon much to the feelings of wronged and injured man. For the want of that amenity, which imparts a fascinating grace to life and manners, there was an ample atonement in

the good which these men effected by their moral heroism in the cause of God, and of the rights of humanity, — by the spirit of self-sacrifice, with which they threw themselves into the pass where the best interests of man were to be defended. It is easy enough to turn into ridicule their harsh and untractable temper, their rigorous adherence to unimportant peculiarities, and their extravagance of religious zeal. But, while these grew out of temporary circumstances, and were shared perhaps in quite an equal degree by the adversaries, from whom the reproach comes, shall we forget that these men sowed that precious seed, from which has sprung the rich harvest of blessings enjoyed by our community? Shall we leave out of the account, that, scorned and flouted as they were by the proud hierarchy of their land, they were still the trusty guardians of that vital principle of freedom, the claims of which have since been so widely felt and respected? The world owes them much; and the progress of time and events is continually developing more distinctly the amount of the obligation. It is not strange, indeed, that while the prejudices of party strife were fresh and strong, it should have been said of the Puritan, — “As he is more generally in these times taken, I suppose we may call him a church-rebel, one that would exclude order, that his brain might rule.”* But the dispassionate judgment of England’s philosophical historian, at a later day and from a better point of view, has declared the truth of the case in a memorable acknowledgment; “So absolute,” says he, “was the authority of the crown, that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect, that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution.”†

But the Puritan character is too wide and fruitful a topic for this place. Its essential elements were

* Owen Felltham’s Resolves, &c. London, 1677. p. 6.

† Hume’s History, Vol. V. p. 134.

noble and praiseworthy. It was the form taken by the strong action of mental energies, not always wisely guided, but aiming with untired perseverance at exalted objects. At the period when New England was settled, the Puritans had for many years been growing in numbers and strength.* But the hope of religious liberty, from time to time disappointed, was so far crushed, that at length many of them turned their eyes away from home, and fixed them on this western region, then lying a mere wilderness under the shade of deep forests, and trodden by no human foot but that of the savage. The enterprise was, strictly speaking, an ecclesiastical concern, and presents the singularly striking case of a nation receiving its existence distinctly and wholly from religious causes.† Our fathers loved their native land with fond affection; they had become attached in no ordinary degree to the soil on which they trod; all the charms of domestic and local associations were there, — their pleasant firesides, and their beautiful fields. They endured and forbore, till endurance and forbearance were in vain. It must have been by a strong moral effect, that they could resolve, in the cause of what they believed to be religious truth and freedom, to sever the ties that bound them to their homes, and to seek a refuge on these shores. While wind and waves were bearing them onward, doubtless they looked back with the exile's feeling to their father-land; and had they not loved the rights of conscience and their duty to God better than that

* In the reign of Elizabeth, Sir Walter Raleigh declared in parliament, that the Brownists alone, in their various congregations, were increased to the number of twenty thousand.—Sir Simonds D'Ewes' *Journals of the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. London, 1682, p. 517.

† "It concerneth New England," said the celebrated John Norton, in a tract printed at Cambridge in 1659, "always to remember, that originally they are a plantation *religious*, not a plantation of trade." — And Increase Mather insists with emphasis, that "it was with regard unto church order and discipline, that our pious ancestors, the good old Puritan Nonconformists, transported themselves and their families over the vast ocean to these goings down of the sun."

land, the hearts of the stoutest must have sunk within them. While they were laying here the foundation of a structure, destined to rise in beauty and greatness of which they could form no conception, they struggled with want and sorrow, and died in loneliness, but in strong faith. When we read the simple, pathetic, and almost childlike story, which they tell of themselves and their doings, we cannot but wish that the veil might have been lifted from the future, and that they might have enjoyed a cheering foresight of the abundant good, that in the course of God's providence was to crown their labors. But the memorial of these undaunted Christians was not forgotten before God. The shield of Heaven was extended over the infant colony, till "a little one became a thousand, and a small one a strong nation."

Previously to the time at which this historical sketch is to begin, settlements had been made at Plymouth and Salem. Of these the object I have in view will not require me to take notice. The accounts of them are familiar to us, or may easily be had from well known sources. I shall accordingly pass to the immediate purposes of this narrative.

The year 1630 was distinguished by the arrival of Winthrop's fleet, bringing a colony, well qualified by the variety of their occupations, and by their spirit of self-denial and perseverance, to form new settlements in the wilderness. Among these were the men, who first visited the place afterward called Watertown. They were from the West of England; and the vessel in which they came (the Mary & John) arrived on the 30th of May, somewhat earlier than the other vessels. Their captain, in defiance of the agreement he had made with them, refused to take them to Charles River, and inhumanly turned them and their goods ashore at Nantasket. The leading men of this company were Roger Ludlow, Edward Rossiter, Esq. Rev. John Maverick, and Rev. John Warham. Having been left in this uncereemonious manner to take

care of themselves, they procured a boat from the people at Nantasket, and proceeded to Charlestown. There they found a few English people, who had removed from Salem the year before, and several wigwams. They took with them "an old planter who could speak Indian," and directed their course up Charles River, till they found the stream narrow and shallow, and landed their goods. The bank of the river is said to have been steep, and the place is described as being "well-watered." It was doubtless very near the spot, on which the United States' Arsenal is now situated. As their number was but ten, they might well be not a little alarmed to learn, as they did at night, that three hundred Indians were in their neighbourhood. The planter, whom they had brought from Charlestown, had probably been so well acquainted with the natives, that he knew how to gain their confidence; for when, on this occasion, he went to them and requested them not to come near the English, they readily complied. The next day a friendly intercourse took place between the two parties. Some of the Indians appeared at a distance, and shortly after one of them advanced and held out a bass. The English, probably understanding this as an invitation to a better acquaintance, sent a man with a biscuit, which the Indians took in exchange. After this amusing mode of introduction, there seems to have been perfect amity between them; and, says one of the company in his interesting narrative, the Indians "supplied us with bass, exchanging a bass for a bisket-cake, and were very friendly unto us." *

* The narrative here referred to was written by Capt. Clap, one of the party, whose adventures he relates. It is entitled "Memoirs of Capt. Roger Clap, relating some of God's remarkable Providences to him in bringing him into New England," &c. This pamphlet, distinguished by a pious simplicity, is the original source of the information we have concerning this first visit to Watertown. From it Prince took his statement: See *Chron. Hist. of New England*, new ed. 1826, p. 277.—also, *Holmes's Annals*, second ed. Vol. I. p. 202.

In connexion with the above mentioned traffic for fish with the natives, it may be proper to remark that Bass, which have become so rare in this

No permanent settlement, however, was made by these men. They remained but a few days, and then removed to Mattapan, afterward called Dorchester, "because there was a neck of land fit to keep their cattle on." Hence, that part of Watertown where these first visitors landed took the name of *Dorchester Fields*, which was its common appellation till a comparatively recent period, and which I have heard some of our oldest inhabitants mention as being in use within their remembrance. It likewise occurs in the earliest town records. Tradition says that these Dorchester settlers were for some time in the habit of resorting to this place, which they had left, to plant corn in the spring and gather it in the autumn; but it is by no means probable, that they would have been at so much trouble for what might have been had near at hand.

Shortly after their removal, a permanent establishment was effected by another company. The colony, who came to Massachusetts Bay, "were not much unlike the family of Noah at their first issuing out of the ark, and had as it were a new world to people, being uncertain where to make their beginning." * — They dispersed themselves in various directions, and laid the foundation of several towns in this vicinity.

region, were found in inexhaustible abundance when our fathers came hither. In a tract entitled "New England's Plantation, or a Short and true Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Countrey," written by Francis Higginson, one of the first pastors of the church at Salem, and printed in London, 1630, it is said, — "There is a fish called a Basse, a most sweet and wholesome fish as ever I did eat; it is altogether as good as our fresh Sammon, and the season of their coming was begun when we came first to New England in June, and so continued about three months' space. Of this Fish our Fishers take many hundreds together, which I have seen lying on the shore to my admiration; yea, their Nets ordinarily take more than they are able to hale to land, and for want of Boats and Men they are constrained to let a many goe after they have taken them, and yet sometimes they fill two Boats at a time with them." Wood, in his "New England's Prospect," affirms that they were sometimes taken in nets "two or three thousand at a set." p. 39.

* Hubbard's History of New England, p. 134.

In the course of the summer of 1630, a party of these adventurous emigrants, with Sir Richard Saltonstall and the Rev. George Phillips at their head, selected a place on the banks of Charles River for their plantation. On the seventh of September, 1630, the Court of Assistants at Charlestown ordered that "Trimountain be called Boston; Mattapan, Dorchester; and the town upon Charles River, Watertown." * This is considered, I believe, as equivalent to an act of incorporation. Ten days must be added to the date on account of the difference of style; † and then the second centennial anniversary of the day, on which this order was passed, and from which we date the foundation of the town, will be brought to the seventeenth of September, 1830. Hubbard, the historian, seems to have been at a loss to account for the name given to this settlement; "The reason for it," he says, "was not left upon record, nor is it easy to find,—most of the other plantations being well watered, though none of them planted on so large a fresh stream as that was." ‡ This last mentioned circumstance probably was the true cause of the selection of the name in question; and perhaps the discovery of some good springs, which might have been made first at this place, may have had some influence, especially with people who are said to have suffered at Charlestown by want of fresh water. || There is a traditionary belief, that the name is to be ascribed to the circumstance of the first company, who came hither and landed at Dorchester Fields, having found a spring of excellent water in the vicinity of the river. But it should be remembered, that the name was not selected till some time afterward, and can hardly be

* Prince, p. 315.

† To adjust the differences of style, ten days are to be added to a date occurring in the seventeenth century, and eleven days to one in the eighteenth century.

‡ Page 135.

|| Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence, Book i. Chap. 17. and Holmes's Annals, Vol. I. p. 204.

supposed to have had reference to this circumstance. The Indian name of the town was Pigsgusset. *

The territory thus called Watertown was, like most of the towns at that early period, very large, and its boundaries on the west side for a considerable time somewhat undefined. Waltham, Weston, and a part of Lincoln, besides what is now called Watertown, were embraced within its original extent. † It appears from the State Records, that the bounds between Watertown and Newtown, now Cambridge, were settled in 1634. ‡ We have no means of ascertaining with precision the number of the first inhabitants; but I find by the town records that in 1636 there were one hundred and eight *townsmen*. Probably the original number in 1630 was considerably less than this. ||

One of the first inquiries in a history so largely ecclesiastical, as that of New England, regards the origin and formation of churches. The true date of the Watertown church is a subject of more perplexity and difficulty, than one would expect in a fact of this nature. It has engaged the attention and divided the opinions of some of our most accurate and able antiquarians; and I know not that any thing of importance can be added to their statements and reasoning. The most recent investigation of the subject is by the Hon. James Savage, to whose opin-

* Wood, on the last page of "New England's Prospect," gives this as the Indian name of Watertown. Ogilby in enumerating the towns in Massachusetts, says — "The ninth is called Watertown, anciently *Pigsgusset*." *America, being an Accurate Description, &c.* Book II. Ch. 2. — The same Indian name occurs once, at a very early date, in the town records.

† A map or plan of Watertown, curious and valuable for its antiquity, was in existence a few years ago, but is now lost. It was sketched in 1640, only ten years after the first settlement of the town, and was obtained by the Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham from one of the oldest inhabitants of his parish, to whom it had come through several generations. This map and a copy of it were unfortunately destroyed in the fire in Court Street, Boston, in November, 1825.

‡ Dr. Kendall's Century Discourse, p. 18.

|| See Appendix, A.

ion the greatest deference is due, and who makes the First church in Boston and the Watertown church precisely coeval, assigning the origin of both to the thirtieth of July, 1630. In this opinion there is good reason to acquiesce; but it seems difficult, if not impossible, to divest the subject of all uncertainty.*

The first minister of Watertown was the Rev. George Phillips, who continued in that office fourteen years. In connexion with the Rev. Mr. Wilson, he had previously been engaged, since their arrival from England, in preaching in Charlestown and Boston; "their meeting-place," says Roger Clap, "being abroad under a tree, where I have heard Mr. Wilson and Mr. Phillips preach many a good sermon."† At the first Court of Assistants, held at Charlestown on board the *Arbella*, it was ordered that as speedily as might be convenient, houses should be erected for the ministers at the public charge. Sir Richard Saltonstall undertook to have this done for Mr. Phillips, and Gov. Winthrop for Mr. Wilson. Mr. Phillips was to have thirty pounds a year, and Mr. Wilson twenty pounds a year till his wife should come. These sums were to be raised, not exclusively from the towns to which the ministers belonged, but by a common charge on all the people, except those at Salem and Dorchester.‡ They were excepted because they already had ministers of their own, settled with them, for whom they were to provide.

It may readily be supposed that the sufferings and privations of men, who with a noble spirit took the wilderness of a new world for their portion, must

* See Appendix B.

† *Memoirs*, p. 22.

‡ *Prince*, p. 314. On Nov. 30th of this year (1630), an order was passed at the Court of Assistants to collect £60 for the maintenance of the ministers, and the portions of the several settlements in this payment were as follows: Boston £20, Watertown £20, Charlestown £10, Roxbury £6, Medford £3, Winnesemet £1.

have been severe. During the winter after their arrival at Massachusetts Bay, they were greatly distressed by an extreme scarcity of provisions. Shell-fish, ground-nuts, and acorns were the only food, which many could obtain. "One, that came to the Governor's house to complain of his sufferings, was prevented, being informed that even there the last batch was in the oven." * Of the climate some of their writers speak very favorably. One of them affirms, that "a sup of New England's aire is better than a whole draft of old England's ale." Among the wild animals, the wolf was a very common annoyance, and against him they were obliged to keep special watch. On one occasion in the night, we are told the report of muskets, discharged at the wolves by some people of Watertown, was carried by the wind as far as Roxbury, and excited so much commotion there, that the inhabitants were by beat of drum called to arms, probably apprehending an attack from the Indians. In the town records, orders are found at different times, "that whosoever shall kill a wolfe in the town shall have for the same five shillings." In some instances, alarm was taken at the report of still more formidable animals in the neighbourhood; and it is not surprising that imagination sometimes supplied whimsical terrors of this sort. †

The sufferings, to which the infant colony were exposed at the outset, carried discouragement to the hearts of many. The settlement at Watertown soon sustained a heavy loss in the departure of its distinguished leader, Sir Richard Saltonstall. On the

* Hutchinson's History of Massachusetts, Vol. I. p. 28.

† It is not a little amusing at the present day to read the following statement, so gravely made by Wood; — "Concerning Lions, I will not say that I ever saw any myself; but some affirm that they have seen a Lion at Cape Ann, which is not above ten leagues from Boston: some likewise being lost in the woods have heard such terrible roarings as have made them much agast, which must be either Devils or Lions; there being no other creatures which use to roar, saving Bears, which have not such a terrible kind of roaring." — *New England's Prospect*, p. 22.

29th of March, 1631, in company with his two daughters and one of his younger sons, he went to Boston; and after spending the night there with the Governor, he proceeded the next day to Salem, sailed thence on the 1st of April, and arrived in London on the 29th of the same month. In the same vessel Thomas Sharp and Mr. Coddington, men of distinction, whose names are found among the earliest members of the Court of Assistants, returned to their native land.* Dudley in his letter to the Countess of Lincoln, having mentioned that these and others were about to take passage for England, adds, "the most whereof purpose to return to us again, if God will."† With regard to Sir Richard Saltonstall, this purpose, if ever entertained, was not accomplished. He never returned to New England, though he left his two oldest sons to carry on the good work which he had begun. The interests of the colony, however, were always uppermost in his thoughts and affections. He lost no opportunity of rendering them all the service in his power, in the mother country. On several occasions he interposed his efforts and influence against the misrepresentations and false charges of their enemies. When Gardiner, Morton, and Ratcliffe, instigated by personal resentment, endeavoured to injure the Massachusetts plantation by laying complaints against them before the king and council, in which they were accused of disloyal and rebellious intentions, Sir Richard Saltonstall in connexion with others was actively engaged in opposing their malicious attempts, and gave ample answers to all their allegations.‡ His interest in New England extended beyond the Massachusetts plantation. He was engaged in the settlement of the Connecticut colony, as a patentee, in company with Lord Say and Seal, Lord Brook,

* Winthrop's New England, Savage's ed. Vol. I. p. 49.

† Massachusetts Historical Collections, 1st Series, VIII. p. 45.

‡ Hubbard. p. 145.

and others. Winthrop informs us, that in 1635 "a bark of forty tons arrived, set forth with twenty servants, by Sir Richard Saltonstall, to go plant at Connecticut." * This vessel on her return was cast away on the Isle Sable, a disaster which Sir Richard ascribed to her having been detained at Boston and at Connecticut River by persons unfriendly to his enterprise, and for which he claimed satisfaction, in a very interesting letter addressed to Winthrop, Governor of the Connecticut colony.† In the political convulsions, which agitated England after his return thither, he espoused the cause of the Parliament with sufficient zeal to secure their confidence; for when a new high court of justice was instituted for the trial of the Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Holland, the Earl of Norwich, Lord Capel, and Sir John Owen, he was commissioned with others to sit for that purpose.‡ Among his services to the colony, it may be mentioned that he was one of the early benefactors of Harvard College, and left in his will a legacy to that institution, then in its infancy. He died about the year 1658.

The family of Sir Richard Saltonstall was an ancient and highly respectable one in Yorkshire. He was the son of Samuel Saltonstall, whose brother had been Lord Mayor of London in 1597. With an honorable zeal and disinterestedness, he gave whatever of influence or wealth he possessed to the Puritan cause. When, at the petition of the Massachusetts company, Charles the First confirmed their patent by charter, Sir Richard was named as the first associate to the six original patentees; and when the government was organized before their departure for New-England, he was chosen first assistant, in which office he continued while he remained with the colony. He was a gentleman of noble qualities of mind

* Vol. I. p. 161. † Hist. Coll. 2d Series, VIII. p. 42.

‡ An animated account of this trial and the executions is given by Clarendon, Book XI. p. 2413.

and heart, and has always been deservedly regarded as one of the venerated fathers of the Massachusetts settlement. His liberal and tolerant spirit in religious matters was truly remarkable for the times in which he lived, and presents to the eye of the historical inquirer a trait of character as honorable and attractive as it was uncommon. When our ancestors, who came hither to find a sanctuary from persecution, were guilty of the melancholy inconsistency of persecuting others, the indignation of Sir Richard was justly moved, and he wrote an admirable letter of expostulation and rebuke to Mr. Cotton and Mr. Wilson, ministers of Boston.* This letter is a noble testimony to his charitable and Christian feelings, and seems to me scarcely less to deserve the praise of being beyond the age, than the celebrated farewell address of John Robinson at Leyden.†

The congregation at Watertown, soon after its establishment, was troubled by an altercation, of which notice is taken by most of the early historians. Mr. Richard Brown, a ruling elder of the congregation, and a man of zealous temperament, had the boldness to avow and defend the opinion, that "the churches of Rome were true churches." In this sentiment, as it would seem from the expressions used by Winthrop, the Rev. Mr. Phillips concurred. Brown probably maintained that the Papal church was not so fundamentally erroneous as to render salvation impossible within her communion. This concession, which we should now regard only as an ordinary exercise of charity or justice, must have been exceedingly offensive in those times of bigotry, especially as it was then made only by the high church

* See Appendix C.

† An interesting account of Sir Richard Saltonstall is given in an article on Haverhill, Hist. Coll. 2d Series, Vol. IV. p. 155; where are likewise notices of his descendants. See also Prince, p. 333; Hutchinson, Vol. I. p. 21; Eliot's Biographical Dictionary; and Winthrop, in various places.

party in England.* The open avowal of the opinion reflects no little honor on the liberality of the elder. Hubbard, however, is disposed to give Mr. Brown no credit for good motives in defending this sentiment; it could not have come, he thinks, from his "charity to the Romish Christians," but from his love of disputation; "the violence of some men's tempers," he observes, "makes them raise debates when they do not justly offer themselves, and like millstones grind one another, when they want other grist."† But we are not bound to receive the historian's interpretation of motives in this case; and he himself states, that "the reformed churches did not use to rebaptize those that renounce the religion of Rome and embrace that of the Reformation," — a circumstance, which might have suggested to Brown considerations in favor of his view of the subject. Whatever may have been the grounds of the opinion in the mind of the elder, as we may readily suppose, it was not suffered to pass without notice and reprehension. On the 21st of July, 1631, the governor, deputy-governor, and Mr. Nowell (elder of the Boston congregation), went to Watertown to confer with Mr. Phillips and Mr. Brown on the subject. An assembly, consisting of members from Boston and Watertown, was called; and thinking, as many in other times have thought, that truth is to be decided by vote, they all, except three, declared the arraigned opinion to be an error. But the matter did not rest here. Brown was neither convinced nor silenced, notwithstanding the power of numbers was against him. He still maintained the ground he had taken; and in consequence of this, and other complaints against him, on the 23d, of November 1631, the Court addressed a letter to the pastor and brethren of the Watertown congregation, advising them to consider whether

* It was a part of one of the articles of impeachment in the trial of Archbishop Laud, that he held the church of Rome to be a true church.

† Page 143.

it were proper to continue Mr. Brown in the office of elder. To this they replied, that if the Court would examine the matter and prove the allegations against Brown, they would do all in their power to redress the evil. Much division appears to have prevailed among the people at Watertown, on account of this and other alleged errors of their elder ; and on the 8th of December both parties went with their complaints to the governor. Accordingly the governor, the deputy-governor, and Mr. Nowell again repaired to Watertown, and having called the people together, told them they would proceed to act either as magistrates, or as members of a neighbouring congregation, or as having received a reply to their letter which did not satisfy them. Of these three modes Mr. Phillips, the pastor, selected the second, requesting them to sit merely as members of a neighbouring congregation, a choice suggested, perhaps, by jealousy of encroachment on the liberties of the church. To this proposal the governor and his associates consented, and the subject in question was then discussed. After much debate and much complaint on both sides, a reconciliation for the present was effected ; they agreed to observe a day of humiliation and prayer ; the pastor gave thanks ; and the assembly was dismissed.*

The excitement, however, continued, if it did not increase, till it could be quieted only by displacing Brown from his station in the church ; and consequently, towards the end of the year 1632, he was removed from his office of ruling elder. He is described as a man of violent spirit, impetuous in his feelings, and impatient of rebuke. But it is no more than justice to him to remember, that during the dispute in which he was involved, he was doubtless exasperated by reproach and severe treatment, and might perhaps

* For these particulars, see Winthrop, p. 67, 95, and Hubbard, p. 143. There is likewise a notice of Brown's case in the valuable "Ecclesiastical History of Massachusetts," Hist. Coll. 1st Series. Vol. IX. p. 21.

have retorted on his opponents the charge of acrimonious deportment. He was a man of respectability and importance in the town, and was the representative of Watertown in the first and in several successive courts of deputies. It appears by the Colony Records, that he was "allowed by the court to keep a ferry over Charles River against his house." Before he came to this country, he had been an officer in one of the churches of the Separatists (as they were called) in London, and was much attached to the discipline of that party. This circumstance renders it the more remarkable, that he should have entertained and declared the opinion concerning the Romish church, which awakened so much indignation among his brethren here. He rendered a praiseworthy service in protecting Dr. William Ames and Mr. Robert Parker, two of the most eminent Puritan divines at that time in England,† by carefully secreting them and conveying them on board their vessel, so that they were enabled to escape from their pursuers.

The name of Brown stands among the foremost in connexion with another excitement, which happened in 1634. Mr. Endicott at Salem, in the earnestness of his zeal against Popery, caused the red cross to be cut out of the king's colors, with no warrant but his own authority. This was done, says Winthrop, "upon the opinion, that the red cross was given to the king of England by the Pope as an ensign of victory, and so a superstitious thing and a relique of antichrist." On this occasion, Richard Brown, in the name of the other freemen, complained to the Court of Assistants against the rash proceeding at Salem. He argued that it would be regarded in England as an act of rebellion, and would draw upon the colony the displeasure of the king and the government. After some consultation, the court agreed to send a letter to Mr.

† For an account of these men, see Neal's History of the Puritans, Vol. II. pp. 69, 96, 280, &c.

Emanuel Downing, a friend of the colony in England, expressing their entire disapprobation of the disrespectful transaction, and their determination to inflict adequate punishment. This letter was to be shown, in order to obviate any unfavorable impressions in the mother country. But their expressions were studiously wary; for it was only the impropriety or imprudence of the act, not the principle on which it was done, that they were disposed to censure.

In February of 1631-32,* an altercation of a political nature occurred, which, for the spirit indicated by it, is well worthy of notice. It was the intention of the leading men in the colony to have made Newtown, now Cambridge, the metropolis of the Massachusetts plantation. The project was in a short time abandoned; for among other reasons, it was soon evident that Boston must be the chief place of commerce. But while this plan was in prospect, the Court determined to erect a fortification at Cambridge, and accordingly passed an order "that sixty pounds be levied out of the several plantations, towards making a palisado."† The portion of this sum, which the people of Watertown were required to contribute, was eight pounds. When the warrant for levying their part was sent, their pastor, elder, and others, taking alarm at what they supposed to be an unjustifiable exercise of power, "assembled the people, and delivered their opinions that it was not safe to pay moneys after that sort, for fear of bringing themselves and posterity into bondage." For this resistance they were sum-

* Before the year 1752, when the *new style* took place, there was sometimes a confusion in dates, owing to the practice of beginning the year in March, so that in some cases a doubt arose whether January, February, and part of March closed the old year, or began the new one. This introduced the mode of double dating as above. After the 25th of March both modes of calculation agree as to the year. In transactions before the 25th of March in any year, it will be most proper to give the dates as if the year began in January. In this way, the date above stated should be February, 1632.

† Prince, p. 390, where the respective parts of the several towns in this tax are given.

moned to answer before the Governor and Assistants. They defended their opposition to the assessment by stating, that they considered the government of the plantation, as it then stood, simply as a mayor and aldermen, who had no power to make laws or levy taxes, without the consent of the people. They were informed, that they had misunderstood the subject, that the government, as it was constituted, partook of the character of a parliament, and might therefore raise money for the public expenditures in the mode which had been adopted. The pastor and his associates were either satisfied with the explanation, or deemed further resistance fruitless and imprudent. They acknowledged their opinion to be an error, and signed a recantation. In order, I suppose, to make their submission the more complete, and to prevent any injurious influence which their weight of character might have given to their opinion, they were required to read this confession in the assembly at Watertown the next Sabbath. But whether their retraction was the result of a change of conviction or not, the view of the subject, on which they grounded their objection to the tax, was doubtless theoretically correct. The charter gave the Governor and Assistants no power to raise money by taxation. This power, however, was assumed for reasons of convenience, perhaps by a sort of necessity ; and the people, finding it exercised justly and mildly, silently acquiesced in the assumption.* It is worthy of remark, that in this occurrence we find the earliest manifestation of that watchful jealousy of unauthorized taxation, which was afterwards developed so strongly, and with such serious consequences, in the disputes between the colonies and the mother country. The grievance complained of in this case, like that of the duty on tea at a subsequent period

* For an interesting and satisfactory elucidation of this point, see Mr. Savage's note on the subject, Winthrop, Vol. I. p. 70.

was in itself inconsiderable. In both cases, the opposition was aimed at the principle, which was thought to be full of danger, — not at the effects of it in an individual instance, which might be trifling.*

In 1632 occurs the first notice of a fishery, which not many years ago was a profitable branch of business in the town, and is of considerable importance at the present day. We are informed, that in April of that year, "a wear was erected by Watertown men upon Charles River three miles above the town, where they took great store of shads." The permission to do this furnished Dudley, the disaffected deputy-governor, with an occasion of accusation against the governor, to whom at that time he bore no good will. When required to specify his charges, among other complaints of an abuse of power, he demanded to be satisfied by what authority the governor "had given them of Watertown leave to erect a wear upon Charles River." The governor replied, that when the people of Watertown asked for permission to build this wear, he told them, as it was not within his official power to grant it, they must petition the Court on the subject; but since the fishing season would be over before the Court should be assembled, he advised them to proceed to their object without delay, assuring them that the Court would doubtless sanction an act so manifestly for the public benefit, and that he himself would use all his influence to secure their approbation of it. He further remarked, as a justification of the proceeding, that the people of Roxbury had built a wear without asking permission of the Court.† The occasion of the application from the inhabitants of Watertown on this subject is worthy of remark. Their crop of corn had failed the preceding summer; and this failure they as-

* Hubbard, regarding only the amount of the tax required, implies, with an air of petulance, that, as their share was but eight pounds, the Watertown people needed not to have "stood so much upon their liberty, as to refuse payment." p. 144.

† Winthrop, Vol. I. p. 84.

cribed to the want of fish, which they used for manure. In order to secure a more plentiful supply of this kind of compost for their fields, they petitioned for the abovementioned privilege. The use of fish for manure was common among our fathers, and they are supposed to have learned it from the Indians. This practice, it is thought, impoverished the soil ; and instances are mentioned, in which it is said to have rendered the land nearly useless. Whether the opinion be well founded, I must leave to others to determine.

In the difficulties, which grew out of the intercourse between the Massachusetts settlers and the Indians by whom they were surrounded, the inhabitants of Watertown had no very conspicuous share. A few instances are related of wrongs or grievances on both sides. In March, 1631, Sagamore John made complaint to the Court, then in session at Watertown, of two wigwams being burnt by the carelessness of Sir Richard Saltonstall's servant. The court voted that Sir Richard should compensate the Indians for their loss. This he did by giving them seven yards of cloth, for which his servant was required, at the expiration of his service, to pay him fifty shillings sterling.* As the injury appears to have been undesigned, this transaction indicates a solicitude to do justice to the Indians, and to maintain good neighbourhood with them. On another occasion, one Hopkins was convicted of selling fire-arms, powder, and shot to an Indian, and was sentenced to be whipped and branded in the cheek. Of the danger of such a traffic with the natives, the first settlers were, with good reason, exceedingly apprehensive ; but all their regulations to prevent it soon proved inefficacious.

The only remarkable instance of Indian vengeance, belonging to this narrative, was in the melancholy fate of John Oldham. Before the settlement at Massachusetts Bay, this man had resided in Plymouth.

* Prince, p. 345.

The violent and disgraceful conduct, of which he in connexion with Lyford was guilty at that place, is well known.* He was banished from Plymouth, after being obliged to pass between two files of armed men, each of whom gave him a blow with a musket, and bade him "go and mend his manners." He first went to Nantasket, but soon after settled at Watertown, and was a member of the congregation there at the time of his death. He had either learned wisdom from experience, and become a reformed man, or, as has been thought by some, his faults were greatly exaggerated by the Plymouth people; for after his removal to Watertown, he was highly respected, and was a deputy from the town in the first General Court in 1632. He became a distinguished trader among the Indians, and in 1636 was sent to traffic with them at Block Island. The Indians got possession of Oldham's vessel, and murdered him in the most barbarous manner. The fact was discovered by one John Gallop, who on his passage from Connecticut was obliged by change of wind to bear up for Block Island. He recognised Oldham's vessel, and, seeing the deck full of Indians, suspected there had been foul play. After much exertion and management, he boarded her, and found the body of Oldham cut and mangled, and the head cleft asunder. Two boys, and two Narraganset Indians, who were with Oldham, the murderers had spared. This atrocious deed excited great indignation in the Massachusetts settlements, and was one of the immediate causes of the celebrated Pequot war, in which that brave and fierce tribe was entirely extinguished.†

Instances of superstition, sufficiently amusing at the present day, are of course to be found in the annals

* See the particulars in *Morton's New England's Memorial*, p. 112, &c., and in *Baylies' Memoirs of Plymouth Colony*, Vol. I. Chap. 8.

† Winthrop, Vol. I. p. 189, and Hutchinson, Vol. I. pp. 59, 75, &c. Of the combined forces for the Pequot war the Massachusetts colony supplied 160 men, and of this number Watertown furnished fourteen.

of this period. Winthrop tells us, that at Watertown there was (in the view of divers witnesses) a great combat between a mouse and a snake; and, after a long fight, the mouse prevailed and killed the snake. The pastor of Boston, Mr. Wilson, a very sincere, holy man, hearing of it, gave this interpretation; "that the snake was the devil; the mouse was a poor contemptible people, which God had brought hither, which should overcome Satan here, and dispossess him of his kingdom." Such pious interpretations were the fashion of the age, and by no means peculiar to New England. We shall be induced to forbear from a smile of contempt at our Puritan fathers on this occasion, when we find Archbishop Usher, one of the most profound scholars of his own or of any times, and Dr. Samuel Ward, president of Sidney College and Margaret reader of divinity lectures, gravely intimating to each other in their correspondence, that there must be some portentous meaning in the circumstance of a book, entitled "A Preparation to the Cross," being found in the maw of a cod-fish, which was sold in the market at Cambridge.*

It seems a very remarkable complaint, so early as 1635, that "all the towns in the bay began to be much straitened by their own nearness to one another, and their cattle being so much increased." This is said to be accounted for by the government having at first required every man to live within half a mile from the meeting-house in his town.† The want of room appears, from some cause, to have been peculiarly felt in Watertown; and on several occasions the inhabitants emigrated and formed new settlements. The first of these was in 1635, at the place afterward called Weathersfield in Connecticut, where, as we are told, some people of Watertown, before they had obtained leave to go beyond the jurisdiction of the

* See Aikin's Lives of John Selden, Esq., and Abp. Usher, p. 317.

† See Mr. Savage's note, Winthrop, Vol. II. p. 152.

Massachusetts government, "took the opportunity of seizing a brave piece of meadow." This brave piece of meadow, it seems, was coveted likewise by their neighbours of Cambridge, some of whom, being about to remove, had fixed their eyes upon this attractive spot, and were vexed at having been anticipated in the possession of it. The consequence was not a little contention and ill-will. Indeed the Watertown plantation at Weathersfield was a scene of dissension, both within and without. In the course of three or four years, the church at that place, which consisted of but seven members, fell into such a state of discord, that the parent church at Watertown thought it necessary to send two of their members to confer with them. Mr. Davenport and others of New Haven were also called in to effect a reconciliation; but in vain; the dissension was not quelled for many years.*

Some scanty notices occur, which indicate the condition and management of affairs in Watertown at this early period of its history. It appears from the town records, that a vigilant attention to the general interests of the settlement was required of every individual; for in 1639 it was ordered, "if any of the freemen be absent from any public town meeting, at the time appointed, sufficient warning being given, he shall forfeit for every time to the town 2s. 6d." In the same year, it was ordered, that "the two fairs at Watertown, the one upon the first Friday of the 4th month, the other upon the first Friday of the 7th month, shall be kept upon the trayning-place," — an intimation that there must have been more business in the town, than one would expect at so early a date. Soon after this, an order is found in the records, by which "the meeting-house is appointed for a watch-house to the use of the town,"† and which may lead

*Hubbard, pp. 177, 307, 314.

†Here is the first mention of a *meeting-house* in the town. It is pretty well ascertained, that it stood on a rising ground between the

to the inference, that it was thought necessary to maintain a patrol in the night, probably for fear of the Indians.

Mr. Phillips was the sole minister of Watertown till 1639. In that year the Rev. John Knowles, "a godly man and a prime scholar," arrived in New England, and on the 19th of December was ordained second pastor of the Watertown church in connexion with Mr. Phillips. The peculiarity of the proceeding on this occasion drew upon the church the notice and animadversion of their brethren in other places. At that time it was the custom, when two were associated in the ministry in the same place, to induct one into office as *pastor*, and the other as *teacher*. This ecclesiastical distinction, whatever it was, seems to have been deemed important by many. But Mr. Knowles, as well as Mr. Phillips, was ordained as pastor;* so that the Watertown church had two *pastors*, and no *teacher*, which was thought to be a censurable anomaly. Another irregularity was, that at the ordination of Mr. Knowles no notice was given of the transaction to the neighbouring churches, nor to the magistrates. It was conducted wholly as an affair of their own, and by themselves. This mode of proceeding was probably owing to a very jealous solicitude to maintain and to manifest their entire ecclesiastical independence. The Congregational principle, which recognises in every religious society the right to choose and ordain its own ministers (though the assistance of others, by a general and laudable custom,

houses of Deacon Moses Coolidge and Mr. Daniel Sawin, on the north side of the road to Cambridge. There was a common before it, which was used as a training-field.

*Dr. Kendal is therefore incorrect in saying that Mr. Knowles "was *teacher* with Mr. Phillips." Cent. Discourse, p. 22. The fact, that he was not so, was the very ground of complaint. It is true he is called *teacher* in Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial; but surely the statement of Winthrop (II. 18), and others of the early New England writers, is of higher authority with regard to a matter which came under their personal knowledge.

is requested on such occasions, as a matter of courtesy and fellowship), was doubtless espoused and defended by Mr. Phillips, whose notions concerning subjects of this sort were for some time regarded with suspicion, and who was unsupported in his views till Mr. Cotton arrived and gave his sanction to the same principles. It is probable, that Mr. Phillips was willing to carry his theory into practice, at the ordination of his colleague, and persuaded his church to adopt the course for which they were blamed. The right, which they assumed, in proceeding without giving notice to other churches, appears not to have been generally recognised at that time.*

Mr. Knowles did not long remain at Watertown. In 1642, in company with other clergymen he went to Virginia, in consequence of the earnest intreaties of some people in that colony, that their spiritual wants might be supplied by faithful ministers from New England. Mr. Phillips had been requested to go on this distant service; but he declined the

* See the case of the Malden church (in 1651). Hubbard, p. 550. With respect to the distinction of office in the ministry, before mentioned, Lechford in treating of the ecclesiastical usages of the Massachusetts colony has the following remarks: "Generally, for the most part, they hold the Pastors and Teachers offices to be distinct; the Teacher to minister a word of knowledge, the Pastor a word of wisdom; but some hold them all one; as in the church of Watertown there are two pastors, neither will that church send any messengers to any other Church-gathering or ordination." Plain Dealing, p. 4. What Lechford meant by *the word of knowledge* and *the word of wisdom*, as designating separate duties, I confess myself unable to comprehend. Probably the distinction between pastor and teacher, founded on Ephesians, iv. 11., was at no time very clear or well defined. If the one was devoted chiefly to parochial duties, while the peculiar business of the other was to study and expound the instructions of sacred truth, or if, as has been said, the teacher's office was principally to explain doctrines, while the pastor was to enforce them with suitable counsels and exhortations, it is easy to see that their respective duties would be continually running into each other, and that, as the line of separation could not be much observed in practice, the distinction would soon become merely titular. Such doubtless was the case; and it may be presumed that pastor and teacher sustained towards each other, in fact, only the relation of colleagues or assistants, with no specific department belonging to each. On this subject, see Mr. Savage's note, Winthrop, I. 31, and Hist. Coll. 1st Series, VII. 271.

invitation, and his colleague took his place. Knowles and his assistants were heartily welcomed by the people in Virginia, and their preaching was blessed with an abundant success. But the Episcopalian influence, which prevailed in the government of that province, soon put a stop to their labors. As they would not conform to the orders and usages of the church of England, they were compelled to leave Virginia. Mr. Knowles returned to Massachusetts, and was again in the ministry at Watertown, associated with Mr. Phillips's successor. He continued there but a short time, and then returned to England after an absence of more than eleven years. Few men were held in so high respect for piety, learning, and talents. He was a native of Lincolnshire, and after having been a student at Magdalen College, Cambridge, was chosen fellow of Katherine-Hall in 1625. In this situation he was employed as a tutor, and had at one time forty pupils, many of whom afterwards became distinguished as members of parliament, or as eminent preachers. In a moment of weakness, he suffered himself to join others in giving a vote for one of Archbishop Laud's bell-ringers, who had been proposed as candidate for a fellowship in Magdalen College, — an act which he never remembered, or spoke of, but with sorrow and repentance. Some time after, he received an invitation to be lecturer at Colchester, which he accepted, and performed the duties of the office with great ability and success. In that place he formed an intimate acquaintance with the Rev. John Rogers of Dedham, one of the most gifted and awakening preachers of his age.* He was with him at his death, and preached his funeral sermon. About this time, the schoolmaster's place at Colchester became vacant, and Mr. Knowles used his influence

* This was the man of whom Bishop Brownrigge used to say, — "Mr. Rogers does more good with his *wild notes* than we [the bishops] with our *set music*."

to have a person chosen in opposition to the recommendation of Laud. On this account, the Archbishop was so angry, that he would suffer him to remain there no longer; and as his license was revoked, he departed for New England. After his return to his native country, he was a preacher in the cathedral at Bristol, and was useful and greatly respected. Being one of the many, who were silenced by the act of uniformity, he went to London, and there preached in private. He remained in the city during the desolating plague in 1665, fearless of danger, and rendered great service by his labors and visits in that distressing extremity. In 1672 he became a colleague with the Rev. Thomas Kentish, and preached at St. Katherine's. The attachment of Mr. Knowles to the duties of his profession was strong, and unshaken by suffering. It was his fate to meet persecution and severe trials, while in London; and to the suggestions of his friends, who were alarmed for his safety, he used to reply, — "In truth I had rather be in a jail, where I might have a number of souls, to whom I might preach the truths of my blessed Master, than to live idle in my own house, without any such opportunities." It is said he was so fervent and earnest, that he sometimes preached till he fainted and fell down. He died on the 10th of April, 1685, at a very advanced age.*

* Mather (Magnal. Book iii. Chap. 3) and Johnson (Wonder-Working Providence, Book ii. Chap. 15, and iii. 11,) have, each in his usual style, given an account of Mr. Knowles and his doings. See also Winthrop, II. pp. 18, 78, 96; Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, ii. 349; and Wilson's History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches, I. 154. Knowles's letters to Gov. Leverett in 1674 and 1677, evincing the interest he felt in the colony and in Harvard College, may be found in Hutch. Coll. 447, 514. Other letters from him are published in Hist. Coll., 3d Series, I. 62, 65. — Lechford's passing notice of him leads us to infer, that he was thought to be peculiar in some of his ideas concerning ecclesiastical matters: "And also I remember Master Knoiles, now one of the pastors at Watertowne, when he first came to be admitted at Boston, never made any mention, in his profession of faith, of any officers of the church in particular, or their duties; and yet was received." *Plain Dealing*, p. 10.

The mode of supporting ministers gave rise, about this time, to some dispute. In Boston, and for some years in other places, their support was derived from voluntary weekly contributions.* But this was found to be too precarious a dependence, and in many places recourse was had to taxation. The introduction of this mode gave great offence to those, who did not like to be compelled to pay for the maintenance of the clergy. Among others, "one Briscoe of Watertown" was so indignant at the supposed grievance, that he wrote, and circulated privately, a book against this way of supporting ministers. This book, of which I presume no copy is now to be found, assumed a tone not only of argument, but of severe and bold reproach. The magistrates thought, that such an offence was not to be overlooked. Briscoe was summoned before the Court, and acknowledged his fault in the use of contumelious expressions, and indeed in having published the book before he had presented his complaints on the subject to the proper authorities. He was fined ten pounds, and one of his publishers was fined forty shillings.†

* So says Hutchinson, I. 376. The notice which Josselyn takes of these contributions, as he witnessed them, is too curious to be omitted. After remarking that the clergy lived upon the "bounty of their hearers," he proceeds to the following particulars: "On Sundays in the afternoon, when Sermon is ended, the people in the Galleries come down, and march two abreast up one Ile and down the other, until they come before the desk, for Pulpit they have none; before the desk is a long pue where the Elders and Deacons sit, one of them with a mony box in his hand, into which the people, as they pass, put their offering, some a shilling, some two shillings, half a Crown, five shillings, according to their ability and good will; after this, they conclude with a Psalm." *Account of Two Voyages to New England*, p. 180. It is easy to see that cases would not be infrequent, in which the "good will" would by no means be equal to the "ability."

† Winthrop, II. 93, and Hubbard, 412. See appendix D. This book excited no little commotion. Hubbard gives vent to his indignation against Briscoe by saying, that such an absurd reasoner "fuste potius erudicndus quam argumento." Mr. Briscoe was a tanner; and the year before this dispute, his barn was burnt, which was deemed a retribution for his refusing "to let his neighbour have leather for corn, saying he had corn enough." However churlish or unkind this refusal might have been, yet surely here was no *dignus vindice nodus*. — But these special

The disposition to emigrate still continued among the Watertown people. In 1642, Thomas Mayhew, whose name appears very early among the first settlers of Watertown, and who in the year just mentioned was chosen one of the Selectmen (as the office was afterwards designated), began the settlement of Martha's Vineyard, and removed his family thither. Lord Stirling laid claim to this and other islands. From his agent, James Forett, Mayhew had, on the 10th of October, 1641, obtained a grant of the land, and he was for many years governor of the island. His son, Thomas Mayhew Jr., was pastor of the church gathered there. This name is much and deservedly honored in the annals of New England. From these ancestors descended the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew of Boston, one of the most enlightened theologians and most energetic patriots our county has ever produced.*

Another plantation was commenced, by some of the people of Watertown, at Nashaway, which was called Lancaster. But the settlement was unprosperous, and its progress slow.†

On the first of July, 1644, died the Rev. George Phillips. The loss was heavily felt not only by the town, but by the colony in general; for he was one of their best and most venerable men. He was born at Raymond, in the county of Norfolk, England. Having given early indications of deep piety, uncommon talents, and love of learning, his parents sent him to the university,‡ where he distinguished himself by remarkable progress in his studies, especially in

judgments were quite common, according to the interpretation of things in those days. Another instance may be found in the case of "one Shaw at Watertown." Winthrop, I. p. 200.

* Holmes's Annals, Vol. I. p. 265, and Hutchinson, Vol. I. p. 151. An interesting memorial of the Mayhews is to be found in Hist. Coll. 2d Series, Vol. III. p. 66.

† Holmes's Annals, Vol. I. p. 273, and Winthrop, Vol. II. p. 161.

‡ Prince (p. 375) supposes it to have been the University of Cambridge.

theological studies, to which he manifested an early partiality. He was settled in the ministry at Boxsted, Suffolk,* and his strong attachment to the principles of the old Nonconformists brought him into difficulty with some of his hearers. They laid their complaints on this subject before Mr. Rogers, of Dedham, who gave this honorable testimony of his confidence in his highly esteemed fellow-laborer, that "he believed Mr. Phillips would preach nothing without some good evidence for it from the word of God." As the storm of persecution grew darker and more threatening, Mr. Phillips resolved to take his lot with the Puritans, who were about to depart for New England. He joined the company, who arrived in 1630. On board the vessel, by his religious ministrations, (as Gov. Winthrop testifies in a letter written at that time) he "gave very good content to all the company, as he did in all his exercises, so as they had much cause to bless God for him." Soon after his arrival, he was smitten with deep affliction in the loss of his wife, who, though an only daughter, had left her parents, to share cheerfully and affectionately the sufferings of her husband. She died at Salem, and was buried by the side of the lady Arbella Johnson, "who," as Mather says, "also took New England in her way to heaven." The ministry of Mr. Phillips at Watertown was fruitful of religious blessings to his flock, and he gave himself to his work with unwearied assiduity and devout zeal. His church expressed very happily and laudably their affectionate respect for the memory of their pastor, by providing for the education of his eldest son, Samuel Phillips, who was afterward the min-

* There is no little confusion in the old writers respecting this place of Phillips's ministry. "Mr. Hubbard" (says Prince, p. 375) "styles him an able and faithful minister of the Gospel at Boxsted in Essex, near Groton in Suffolk: but Boxford being in Suffolk, and Boxsted in Essex, and both near Groton, I suppose that Boxford, in Dr. C. Mather is a mistake of the printer." Prince, in correcting Mather about the town, has himself fallen into an error about the county, for Boxsted is in Suffolk about 60 miles N. N. E. from London.

ister of Rowley. Mr. Phillips is said to have been an able controversial writer. One of his hearers obtained from him a written copy of arguments, which he had used in conversation concerning the baptism of infants and church discipline, and sent it to England where it was printed, accompanied with an answer. Mr. Phillips thought it necessary to take notice of this book, and he published a "Reply to a Confutation of some Grounds of Infant Baptism; as also concerning the Form of a Church, put forth against me by one Thomas Lamb." A preface for this work was written by the Rev. Mr. Shepard of Cambridge. I have been able to discover no copy of this publication, and I presume it is not now to be found. Phillips also engaged in a controversy, by letter, with his neighbour Mr. Shepard, on some points of church discipline. The discussion is said to have been distinguished by candor and urbanity on both sides, but was never published. This subject was one, in which the minister of Watertown was deeply versed and peculiarly skilful. He was the earliest advocate in Massachusetts for the Congregational order and discipline; and his views were for a time regarded as novel and extreme.* He seems to have been more thorough and decided in renouncing the ecclesiastical forms of the church of England, than others were at that time; for he declared, that "if they would have him stand minister by that calling, which he received from the prelates in England, he would leave them."† It is mentioned

* "It is said that Mr. Phillips of Watertown was at the first more acquainted with the way of church discipline, since owned by Congregational churches; but, being then without any to stand by him (for woe to him that is alone), he met with much opposition from some of the magistrates, till the time that Mr. Cotton came into the country, who by his preaching and practice did by degrees mould all their church administrations into the very same form, which Mr. Phillips labored to have introduced into the churches before." Hubbard, p. 186.

† This is stated on the authority of a letter from Samuel Fuller, the physician of Plymouth, found in Gov. Bradford's Letter Book. See Hist. Coll. 1st Series, Vol. III. p. 74. And yet, notwithstanding this apparently uncompromising spirit, the name of Phillips is found among the

as a singularity in Mr. Phillips's ecclesiastical conduct, that he administered the ordinances to the churches in Boston, when their pastor Wilson had gone to England; for, strange as it may seem, the right of a minister to administer the ordinances to any church but his own, was at that time so much denied or doubted, that Phillips is said to have been the only man, who was willing to venture upon such an exercise of the sacred office. He was evidently a man of firmness and independence, conscientious in forming and fearless in maintaining his opinions. He was noted for his learning in the original languages of the Scriptures, which he is said to have read through six times every year, and to have remarked that he always found something new in them. It is recorded of him, with beautiful simplicity, that he was "a godly man, specially gifted, and very peaceful in his place, much lamented of his own people and others." There is a tradition, that he lived in the house now occupied by Mr. Daniel Sawin, opposite the old burying-ground. Among his descendants was the late Hon. William Phillips of Boston, Lieut. Governor of this Commonwealth.*

Mr. Phillips's successor in the ministry at Watertown was the Rev. John Sherman. The date of his settlement cannot be ascertained. Our records make no mention of the transactions concerning it. We only know from them, that he was in the pastoral office in the town as early as 1648. In that year is recorded a grant of 120 pounds, to be equally divided

subscribers to the well known and interesting letter written on board the *Arbella*, in which so much of kindness and respect is manifested towards the church of England.

*The most ample account of Mr. Phillips is given by Mather, (*Magnal.* Book iii. Chap. 4,) from which others have for the most part drawn their information. The sorry muse of Johnson (*Wonder-Working Providence*, Book i. Chap. 23,) has endeavoured to grace his name with a well meant effusion of panegyric. Frequent notices of him occur in Winthrop. Eliot & Allen (*Biographical Dictionaries*) have given short accounts of him. See also Holmes's *Annals*, Vol. I. p. 276, and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, Vol. II. p. 493.

between him and Mr. Knowles, who was then associated with him in the ministry. Mr. Sherman came to New England in 1634, and preached at Watertown as an assistant to Mr. Phillips for a few weeks only. The first sermon he delivered was on a day of thanksgiving, kept by the people of the town in the open air under a tree. There were several clergymen present; and, we are told, they "wondered exceedingly to hear a subject so accurately and excellently handled by one, who had never before performed any such public service." Shortly after this, he removed to New Haven, and was earnestly requested to settle as a colleague at Milford. This invitation he declined from motives of delicacy towards the person who was already settled in that place. He then, for a while, quitted his professional duties entirely, went into civil life, and was chosen a magistrate of the colony. In this office he continued two or three years. After the decease of Mr. Phillips, the church at Watertown, anxious to form a permanent connexion with a man, whose services, for the short time he was among them, had been so very acceptable, invited Mr. Sherman to become their pastor. He returned to the duties of the sacred office, and accepted the invitation, though about the same time he was solicited to settle in the ministry by one church in Boston, and by more than one church in London.

The contest between the king and the Parliament, by which England was at this time convulsed, excited of course a very lively interest in New England. The feelings, which the people had brought to this western world, would not suffer them to be neutral in such a conflict; and they would naturally espouse with zeal the cause of the Parliament. One Jenyson, however, who was captain of a military company at Watertown, and a man of considerable repute, seems not to have sympathized with the general feeling on this subject. He ventured, in conversation to call in

question the lawfulness of the proceedings of the English Parliament; and for this offensive freedom of speech he was in 1644 cited to answer before the magistrates. He did not deny that he entertained scruples respecting the conduct of the Parliament, but complained that he should have been so suddenly called to answer in public for a mere matter of opinion, before any inquiries had been made, or any conversation held with him, in a private and friendly way. The Court were conscious that they had proceeded too rashly with him; but still they feared that with such opinions he would be an unsafe man to hold a military commission, though he acknowledged the Parliament party to be the better and more honest men, and was only not quite sure that, if he were in England, he should feel authorized to appear in arms against his king. One would suppose, that this expression of loyalty was sufficiently guarded and moderate, to save Capt. Jenyson from the censure of his brethren. But such was the spirit of the times, that he found it prudent to retract even this testimony of allegiance to his sovereign; and after the court had given him time to consider the subject, he satisfied them by declaring that, on further examination, he believed the cause of the Parliament to be entirely just, and that, if he were in England, he would engage in its defence.

In the year 1647 there occurs, in the town records, the first notice of some complaint and difficulty about what was called "the remote meadow." Some alleged that their portion of it was not laid out, and others that what was assigned to them was bad. The *remote meadow* was probably some tract of land in the distant western part of the town, of which a division had been made among the first settlers on some principle deemed equitable. It is likely that the interfering claims and jealousies, which are common in such cases, caused much dissatisfaction. From the transactions at the town meetings, it appears that the

meadow land was a source of uneasiness, and a subject of votes, for several years.

At a meeting of "the seven men," or Selectmen, on the 28th of December, 1647, "Mr. Biscoe and Isaac Stearnes were chosen to consider how the bridge over the river shall be built, and to agree with the workmen for the doing of it according to their best discretion." This is the earliest mention of a bridge over Charles river at Watertown. Till this time, we may presume, the stream had been crossed only by ferries. It has already been mentioned, that Richard Brown was empowered by the court to keep a ferry opposite his house. The first bridge was doubtless a rude and temporary structure. Twenty years after the above date, the land "upon the meeting-house common" was ordered to be sold to defray the expense of a bridge at the mill, which was "to be built *with baskets*;" and the selectmen were directed "to order the number of baskets, and the plan and manner of placing them."

The term here used in relation to the architecture of the bridge, I have been informed, was employed to designate certain frames of wood, like boxes, placed at regular distances, filled with stones, and connected by timbers. Perhaps the term was borrowed from military affairs. At sieges, use has sometimes been made of *baskets* filled with earth, and ranged on the top of the parapet. These are about a foot and a half in height, about the same in diameter at the top, and eight or ten inches at bottom; so that, when set together, they leave a sort of embrasures at the bottom. It would seem from subsequent notices, that the bridge spoken of in the above extract was not designed for the passage of carriages of any kind, but was merely a foot or horse bridge. At that early period, commodities were transported almost entirely in panniers on horseback. Wheel-carriages were very rarely, if ever, used; and when they did pass the river, they doubtless forded it, as may now be done at low tide. With

this foot or horse bridge the people were satisfied for more than fifty years after this date. It was placed a few rods further down the stream, than the present bridge.

It is recorded in 1647, that the town disposed of their right "in the palisado that inclosed *the woulfe pen*." I know not what we are to understand by "the wolf pen," unless it were an enclosure surrounded by a high and strong defence, into which the sheep and cattle were driven for security from the wolves in the night, and which was owned and used by all the town in common.

At a meeting of the seven men in 1648, it was "ordered that Mr. Biscoe and John Sherman* shall mark certaine trees in the highway with a W, that shall continue for shade; and that whosoever shall fall any trees so marked shall forfeit 18 shillings to the town for every tree so fallen." It is somewhat remarkable, that such a provision should have been made only eighteen years after the first settlement of the place. The example is worthy of imitation. There are few things, which contribute more to the beauty and comfort of a village, than rows of trees by the road side; and it is a matter of surprise and regret, that a mode of improvement so agreeable to good taste, and attended with so little expense or trouble, should be so much neglected at the present day.

In 1649 a vote was passed to build a school-house. Whether this was the first school-house erected in the town, cannot be ascertained. Schools had been kept, and teachers employed, several years before this time. At the same meeting, it was agreed to build a gallery in the meeting-house. Before and about this time,

* The name of this individual appears frequently in the transactions of the town from the beginning, and he seems to have been in high repute. Whether there was a family relation between him and the Rev. John Sherman, I know not. There probably was, however; for they both came from the same place, Dedham in England. He held at different times the offices of captain, town clerk, and representative.

votes were likewise passed about *the mill*; and in 1653 it was ordered that "the mill shall be rated to the ministry for this year, at a hundred and forty pounds."

At a public town meeting held in October, 1654, a movement was made, though it seems to have proved ineffectual, towards erecting a new house of worship. It was "ordered by the inhabitants that there should be a new meeting-house builded." They fixed upon the place where it should stand, and voted to raise 150 pounds "to begin the work withal." It was likewise ordered, "that Cambridge meeting-house shall be our pattern in all points." Soon after this an agreement was made by the Selectmen with John Sherman to build a meeting-house for the town, "like unto Cambridge in all points." It was to be finished by the last of September, 1656, and Mr. Sherman was to receive for it four hundred pounds, together with some parts of the old house. From notices of votes at subsequent meetings in 1654, it appears there was difficulty or disagreement about the place, where the new house should stand; and at last this point was left "to the determination of three of the honoured Magistrates," whose decision was to be final. But, notwithstanding these preparatory measures, the meeting-house was not built. The purpose was abandoned for the present; but was resumed at different periods afterward, till it was accomplished.*

* As Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence* was published in 1654, the following extract seems to belong to this place. He describes Watertown as "scituate upon one of the branches of Charles River, a fruitfull plat, and of large extent, watered with many pleasant springs and small rivulets, running like veines throughout her body, which hath caused her inhabitants to scatter in such manner, that their Sabbath-Assemblies prove very thin, if the season favour not, and hath made this great towne (consisting of 160 families) to shew nothing delightful to the eye in any place." B. I. ch. 23. If the latter part of this description be correct, perhaps it may furnish an explanation of the abovementioned attempt to have a new meeting-house; for if the population were thus scattered, a great part of them must have found it very inconvenient to attend worship in a house situated at the eastern

In 1662, "the proprietors of the farm lands" are mentioned as holding separate meetings for the regulation of certain affairs of their own. By this designation is doubtless meant the same part of the town, the inhabitants of which, as will be seen, were afterwards called *The Farmers*, and which is now Weston.

It would seem that, at this early period, the meeting-house was not divided into pews, held by individuals as their property. It was probably filled with long and undivided seats, which were considered as the common property of the whole town, and in which places were assigned to individuals and families according to some authorized arrangement. That such was the case would appear, at least, from the record of a town-meeting in 1663, when a committee "made their return of what they had jointly agreed upon about the seating of the inhabitants in the meeting-house; which being twice read, it was accepted by the town." At the same time, it was ordered, "that the next Sabbath day every person shall take his or her seat appointed to them, and not go into any other seat where others are placed; and if one of the inhabitants shall act contrary, he or she shall for the first offence be reprov'd by the deacons; and for the second offence to pay a fine of two shillings, and the like fine for every offence after." The provision on this subject was extended still further, by ordering that for the future Nathaniel Treadaway and Joseph Taynter, with the deacons, are chosen and empowered to act in all emergent occasions, to place people in the meeting-house, as need do require."*

extremity of so large a settlement. What Johnson means by placing Watertown on *one of the branches* of Charles River, I cannot tell; he blundered in this statement, and it is to be hoped that he blundered in saying the town presented "nothing delightful to the eye in any place."

* The watchful care of our ancestors to secure the quiet and good order of the Sabbath services from all annoyances, is manifest from the following amusing notice, at the same meeting with the above: "Thomas Whitney was chosen to take care that no dogs come into the meeting-house upon the Sabbath days, or other times of publick worship, by

Minute and careful regulations as to the duties of the Sabbath were enforced from high authority, as will appear from the following record at a meeting of the Selectmen in 1665: "The pastor being present, the two Constables were chosen to take care of the youth upon the Sabbath days and other times of public worship *in reference to the order of Court.*" And that a vigilant guardianship was exercised over manners and morals is evident from a notice, that "James Hollen appearing before the Selectmen to answer for his living from under family government, and mispending his time by idleness, the Selectmen gave him a fortnight's time to provide himself a master; and in case he did it not in that time, that then they would provide one for him."

In October, 1674, an attempt was made to procure assistance in the ministry for the Rev. Mr. Sherman. "The town declared by vote, that they do desire Mr. Thomas Clark to be helpful to Mr. Sherman in preaching of the word amongst us; and this in order to a further proceeding with him in reference to settling amongst us by way of office, if God make way for it." We learn nothing more concerning this Mr. Clark, and nothing is said of the result of this vote. It is probable, that Mr. Clark did not comply with the request of the town, and that in consequence of his refusal, the proposal to obtain an assistant for Mr. Sherman was for the present dropped.

In the summer of 1676* a very remarkable mortality

whipping them out of the house, or any that be near to the house at such times; and to have for his pains and care thirty shillings the year." A severe vote of a similar kind was passed against the dogs so late as the year 1746.

* According to Hubbard, p. 648. But the Rev. John Eliot of Roxbury, in a letter to the Hon. Robert Boyle, places it in 1670. The letter is dated September 30th of that year, and gives the following curious particulars: "There hath been a rare work of God this summer in a great pond at Watertown, where all the fish died, and were not willing to die in the waters, but as many as could, thrust themselves on shore, and there died; not less than twenty cart load, by estimation, lying dead all at once round about the pond. An eel was found alive in the

happened among the fish "in a great pond in Watertown," (by which is meant what is now called Fresh Pond.) It is stated that they died in immense numbers and were floated to the shore, or swam to the shore and died there. Some, in the spirit of the times, regarded this singular phenomenon as an extraordinary and inexplicable interposition of Providence; while those, who were disposed to speculate about it, conceived it to be "the effect of some mineral vapour, which at that time had made an irruption into the water." Whether this be a satisfactory account of the matter may be questioned; but of the occurrence of the fact, as related, there seems no reason to doubt.

After the Restoration in England, many from whatever cause had neglected to take the oath of allegiance. At a town-meeting a committee was appointed to see that every one, who had not taken the oath of fidelity and allegiance, as the law required, should do so. There was probably a general feeling in the colony, that it was politic or necessary to remove from themselves all suspicion of being unfriendly to the king and government in the mother country.

What kind of oversight was taken of the young people, at this time, may be learned from the record of some meetings in 1679. The Selectmen agreed, that "they would go two and two through the town to see that all the children be taught to read the English tongue, and some orthodox catechism, and to take the names of all youths from ten years old unto twenty years old, that they may be publickly catechized by the pastor in the meeting-house." Soon after this, a vote was passed to do "something for placing of the

sandy border of the pond, and being cast into the water, she wriggled out again as fast as she could, and died on the shore. An inhabitant of the town living by the pond, his cattle used daily to drink there; but then, for three days together, they refused there to drink, but after three days they drank of the pond as they were wont to do. When the fish began to come ashore, before they died, many were taken and eaten, both by English and Indians, without any hurt; and the fish were very good." Hist. Coll. 1st Series, III. 177.

youth, that so they may be the better inspected in time of public worship." A committee was chosen for this purpose, and also to enlarge the meeting-house, that it might accommodate as many as possible "both of the youth and grown persons." This was to be done by building galleries in the meeting-house, and twenty-five pounds were added to the town rate for that object. It would seem from this arrangement, that the children and the younger portion of the congregation had distinct seats assigned to them on the Sabbath, in order to place them more effectually under the watch and care of the older people. The time, when such regulations were thought useful and judicious, has passed away; but they deserve to be mentioned here as proofs of the solicitude, with which our fathers attended to the interests of the rising generation.

In the record of a meeting of the Selectmen, April 5, 1680, the following notice is found: "In reference to a late order from Honoured General Court, in which the Selectmen of several towns were ordered to make a return concerning what was done, or further to be done, referring to the subscription to *the New College*, Deacon Henry Bright and William Bond were by the Selectmen appointed to go down to Boston to make said return." The sum contributed by Watertown was £41. 16s. 3d. "The New College" must have been the edifice called Harvard, which stood on the spot where the building now bearing that name stands, and was built in 1672 by contribution from the different towns in the colony. If the record refers to this contribution, however, it is strange that it should be so late as eight years after the erection of the college.

The growing infirmities of the Rev. Mr. Sherman again turned the attention of the town to the subject of procuring assistance for him. In November, 1680, it was voted, "in regard of the bodily weakness that is upon pastor Sherman, that he stands in need of a helper to carry on the work of the ministry." It is not mentioned

that any measures were taken to obtain the proposed help till November, 1684, when the town agreed to employ for this purpose one of three, whose names were specified ; Mr. Cotton, Mr. Leavitt, and Mr. Brattle.* The first application was to be made to Mr. Cotton, and " the utmost endeavours were to be used to gain him." Whether the application was actually made to him, or to either of the three, or, if made, was successful, we are not told. It appears however, that assistance was obtained for the pastor, since money was appropriated to defray the expenses for that purpose.

But all further provision of this kind was soon rendered unnecessary by the death of the Rev. Mr. Sherman. He was seized with a severe illness at Sudbury, where he preached his last sermon from Ephesians ii. 8. He recovered from the first attack sufficiently to be able to reach home. But his disease, which was an intermitting fever, returned with violence, and he expired on the 8th of August, 1685, aged nearly seventy-two years.

It is but justice to say, that a tribute of high praise is due to the memory of Mr. Sherman. Few divines, in the early history of New England, were so eminently distinguished by intellectual gifts and Christian graces. He was born December 26, 1613, in Dedham, in the county of Essex, England. The parental influence under which his first years were passed, implanted and strengthened the principle of piety in his breast ; and he received deep religious impressions, at an early period, from the ministry of the celebrated John Rogers, whose friendship he, as well as his two predecessors in the ministry at Watertown, possessed and prized highly. It is related, that he was never chastised at

* This Mr. Brattle, I suppose to be the same, who was graduated at Harvard College in 1680, and was ordained in 1696 pastor of the Cambridge church, (See Hist. of Cambridge, in Hist. Coll. 1st Series, VII. 55.) Two persons of the name of John Cotton appear in the College Catalogue, in 1678 and in 1681, both clergymen ; and one of these was probably the person abovementioned. Of Mr. Leavitt I have met with no notice.

school but once, and then it was "for giving the *heads of sermons* to his idle school-mates, when an account thereof was demanded from them." He was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, but received no degree, because conscientious scruples compelled him to refuse compliance with the required subscription. This refusal appears to have been the result of a faithful and anxious consideration of the subject. The consequence was, that he retired from the University "under the persecuted character of a *College Puritan*." He soon left England, and sought an asylum in the western world. When he came to New England (1634), he was but twenty-one years of age; but, young as he was, his eloquent preaching and powerful mind gave him a very high reputation, insomuch that when he was at New Haven, Mr. Hooker and Mr. Stone, the clergymen of Hartford, said in an assembly of ministers, before whom Sherman had preached, "Brethren, we must look to ourselves and our ministry, for this young divine will outdo us all."

After his settlement at Watertown, he maintained fully the distinguished rank which he had before acquired, and was considered a great blessing to his people and to the neighbouring churches. He was chosen fellow of the corporation of Harvard College, and rendered various and important services to that institution. Once a fortnight he gave lectures, which were attended by the students of the College, who walked from Cambridge to Watertown to hear him, and by many other persons from the vicinity. These lectures he continued for thirty years, and they were regarded as peculiarly able and valuable. Mr. Sherman improved the powers of his mind, naturally strong and penetrating, by profound and indefatigable study. His philological learning is reported to have been much beyond the usual attainments even of such as were considered good scholars. But his favorite studies, out of his professional course, were the mathematical and astronomi-

cal sciences. In these pursuits he was the first man in the country, at that time.* He left many astronomical calculations in manuscript, which were never published. So desirous was he of being useful, that he sometimes undertook the humble task of preparing almanacs for the community. In these he inserted pious and pertinent reflections, instead of that frivolous and useless matter with which these publications are so often filled.† The study of the exact sciences, on which he bestowed so much attention, while it sharpened his powers of reasoning and discrimination, did not impair the energy or eloquence of his preaching. His sermons are said to have been so distinguished by the beauties of a rich and fervid imagination, and by an unaffected and impressive loftiness of style, that he was commonly called “the golden-mouthed preacher.” Though his discourses were frequently extemporaneous, they were always well arranged and full of thought. Being a devout and unwearied student of the Scriptures, his public instructions enlightened the minds as well as warmed the hearts of his hearers. In conversation it was his habit to say but little. But what he said was pointed, and likely to be remembered; and when he was told by his more loquacious companions, that he had learned the art of silence, he sometimes advised them to attend more to that art themselves. So strong was his memory, that his own mind, it was said,

* We are not informed what were the subjects of Mr. Sherman's lectures to the students of the College; but it is probable, they were connected with the studies, to which he was so partial, and in which he became so distinguished.

† The following is a specimen of these reflections:—“Let me entreat one thing of thee, and I will adventure to promise thee a good year; the request is in itself reasonable, and may be to thee eternally profitable. It is only this; duly to prize and diligently to improve time, for obtaining the blessed end it was given for, and is yet graciously continued unto thee by the eternal God. Of three hundred and sixty-five days allowed by the making up of this year, which shall be thy last, thou knowest not; but that any of them may be it, thou oughtest to know, and so consider, that thou mayest pass the time of thy sojourning here with fear.”

became his library ; and so highly respected was his judgment, that when he was consulted, as he very frequently was, his opinion was generally considered final. His mental powers remained vigorous and keen to the time of his death ; and his last discourse was listened to with admiration for its richness of thought and energy of language. When the reforming synod, as it was called, convened at Boston, in September, 1679, he was one of the joint moderators of that body during the greater part of the session. In 1682 he preached the sermon before the convention of Congregational Ministers in Massachusetts ; and this is the first sermon on that occasion, now upon record.*

Mr. Sherman was the father of twenty-six children in two marriages ; six in the first, and twenty in the other. His second wife was granddaughter of the Earl of Rivers, whose family belonged to the Roman Catholic party in England.† Her mother, daughter of the Earl of Rivers, was married to Mr. Launce, a Puritan gentleman, and was herself a Puritan, though of a Popish family. The lady, to whom Mr. Sherman was married, was at that time under the guardianship of Gov. Hopkins of Connecticut. She survived her husband many years.‡ Among the descendants of this minister of Watertown, the Hon. Roger Sherman, one of the memorable committee who drew up and report-

* See a list of the preachers in the " Historical Sketch of the Convention," &c. p. 30.

† Clarendon relates that the house of the Countess of Rivers, near Colchester, was plundered in 1642 by the rabble, on account of her being a Papist. Vol. III. p. 1086.

‡ Mrs. Sherman died in 1710 ; and in the town record of that year is the following notice of her funeral : " The selectmen being informed that Mrs. Mary Sherman is deceased, being the widow of the Reverend pastor Sherman, who was the pastor of the town for many years, from a sense of the honour and respect the town had to their Reverend Pastor and his widow since his decease, and to express the same in this their last office of love, do order that Capt. Jonas Bond, Esq., who is one of the said Selectmen, do provide wine and gloves sufficient for said funeral at the town's cost, not exceeding the sum of ten pounds, and Mr. Bond to be seasonably repayed out of the present town rate."

ed the Declaration of Independence, has sometimes been erroneously reckoned. That distinguished patriot descended from Capt. John Sherman, who came from Dedham, England, and settled in Watertown in 1635, and who, as has been already mentioned, was probably a relative of the minister.*

Mr. Sherman was succeeded by the Rev. John Bailey, with whom his brother, Thomas Bailey, was for a while associated. One of these brothers, about two months before Mr. Sherman's death, had been invited to become his assistant; but whether he came to Watertown at that time does not appear. A committee was chosen at a town meeting on the 24th of August, 1685, to treat with "Mr. Bailey the elder," i. e. Mr. John Bailey, on the subject of settling in the ministry at Watertown. Subsequently to this, there was much debate about procuring a residence for the expected clergyman. It was proposed to build a parsonage; but the report of the committee, appointed to select a place for this purpose, was not accepted. The next proposal was to hire a house for the minister; and the persons, to whom that business was entrusted, found a suitable one. But neither does this step seem to have given satisfaction. A vote was then passed, "that if a number of persons would build a convenient house to entertain the minister in near to the meeting-house, the town would pay them that build it rent for the said house, until the town do agree and have actually removed this meeting-house, or built another in the room of this, more convenient for the inhabitants, somewhere else where the town shall agree upon." From this vote, it would seem that the difficulty in procuring a dwelling for the clergy-

* Mather has furnished the most elaborate account of the Rev. Mr. Sherman, (*Magnal.* Book iii. Chap. 29.) See also Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, III. 482, and Eliot's and Allen's *Biographical Dictionaries*. Allen has committed the error of making Mr. Gibbs the successor to Mr. Sherman in the ministry at Watertown. See Appendix E.

man was connected with a proposal, then under discussion, for a new place of worship. This subject, as we have seen, had been before the town in 1654; it was now revived, but was again set aside for the present.

The proceedings relative to the settlement of Mr. John Bailey are stated, in the town records, with considerable exactness. He was requested, through a committee, to give the town an opportunity, at a general meeting of the inhabitants, "to discourse a little with him" on the subject. He complied with the request; and a meeting of the people was called, at which certain persons were designated by vote "to discourse with Mr. Bailey." At this conference, he declared himself ready and willing to become their minister, "if peace and love should continue amongst them, and they would make his life comfortable." Soon after, the town provided means to remove him and his family from Boston, where he then resided, to Watertown. In the month of August a call was formally given him "at a general town meeting," which he accepted, and was ordained October 6th, 1686.* Within a month after this date, measures

* In Judge Sewall's manuscript Journal is the following record: "July 25, 1686, Mr. John Bayley preaches his farewell sermon, and goes the 28th to Watertown. Oct. 6, Mr. Bayley ordained at Watertown. Mr. Bayley *not ordained as congregational men are.*" The informality on this occasion, to which Judge Sewall alludes in the last sentence, was, I presume, the omission of "the laying on of hands," a circumstance which intimates that Mr. Bailey regarded his previous ordination in England as valid, and therefore did not think it necessary to have the token of consecration to the sacred office renewed. This circumstance Mr. Bailey has himself mentioned in the following notice found in his book of records, in which, it will be observed, he does not call the ceremony of his induction into office at Watertown an *ordination*: "Upon the 6th of October, 1686, I was solemnly *set apart* for the pastoral work at Watertown, *without the imposition of hands.* I am sick of it, and unfit for it; but the many particulars that attended this work I wholly omit." These last expressions indicate the feeling of dread and responsibility, with which this good man entered on his work. On this occasion, he preached the sermon himself from 2 Cor. ii. 16. compared with 2. Cor. xii. 9. The manuscript of this sermon I have seen; from the commencement of it we should infer that he was settled as a *teacher*, not as *pastor*; it is as follows: "Some other Scriptures I had thought

were taken to procure his brother to be his assistant, it being declared, "with a very full vote, that the town did earnestly desire that they might enjoy Mr. Bailey the younger to be helpful to his brother in the ministry." Indeed, before this time, the same desire had been expressed. Mr. Thomas Bailey delayed his acceptance of this invitation for a considerable time, if we may judge from the date of his first coming to reside at Watertown, which was November 2d, 1687. But it is not unlikely, that he had before this, while living in Boston, acted as assistant to his brother. His ministry was of short duration. He died January 21st, 1688-9, aged 35 years, and was interred in the old burying ground in Watertown, where a humble monument now stands over his grave. His brother John, in his diary, says of him, "He died well, which is a great word, — so sweetly as I never saw the like before." *

We learn from our records, that the mode of supporting the public school at this time was somewhat different from the present. The salary of the school-master was twenty pounds. Every person who sent children to the shool, was required to pay three pence a week for each child he sent; and whatever was wanting of the teacher's stipend from this source was made up by a payment from the town.

When in consequence of the troubles resulting from the government of Sir Edmund Andros, a meeting of representatives from all the towns in the colony was called at Boston, each town was required to give

to have given you, and partly had in my thoughts begun; as that in Zech. ii. 7. and that in 2 Cor. v. 20. But tho' these might better suit others, yet the words I have read do best suit myself; a pastoral work being alwaies dreaded by me, I could never get inclined to it, nor ever looked upon myself as fit for it."

* Scarcely any thing worthy of special notice is recorded of Thomas Bailey. Some of his writings are preserved, in manuscript, in the cabinet of the Massachusetts Historical Society. They consist of Latin odes, or poems in various kinds of measure, and verses on the Gunpowder Plot in his own hand-writing, dated November 5th, 1669.

instructions to its members, whether to vote for reassuming the charter or not.* The people of Watertown chose two representatives to appear for them at this meeting on the 22d of May, 1689, and instructed them to maintain "the charter rights," and to agree to the declaration set forth at a previous meeting of representatives, till further orders should be received from the English Government. The same course was taken by a large majority of the towns on this occasion. The alarm, spread through the colony at this time, was however soon quieted by the change which took place in affairs, when William and Mary ascended the British throne.

October 14th, 1690, the town voted to request Mr. Henry Gibbs to be an assistant in the work of the ministry, Mr. Bailey being by the death of his brother now left alone. In the application to procure this assistance, they say, "in this time of our great want, that the town might not be destitute of one to administer the word and ordinances of Christ among us." These expressions lead us to suppose that the labors of Mr. Bailey must have been frequently interrupted by ill health, or some other cause, and the town consequently left destitute of pastoral services. Mr. Gibbs signified his acceptance of the invitation. His salary, as assistant pastor, began on the 3d of the following November.

In 1692 Mr. Bailey left Watertown, and returned to Boston.† There he became, the next year, assistant

* Hutchinson, Vol. I. p. 344.

† The following is Mr. Bailey's own notice of the last Sunday he preached in Watertown, as inserted in his book of records. The minute detail of his farewell, while it excites a smile, indicates an affectionate interest, that is pleasing. "I did particularly bid farewell to my house, old walks, all the three parts of the town, my assistant Gibbs, the schoolmaster, deacons, selectmen, military persons, two constables, the burying-place, my servant that lived with me formerly, this old church, the three or four meetings in the town, this neighbourhood of mine, saints but sinners also, old but young also, all my children which grieved me most, friends and foes, the sweet singers of Israel, all widows and fatherless families, all moralized persons, all that heard me not now,

minister in the First Church. In that office he continued till his death, which took place the 12th of December, 1697, in the 54th year of his age. The reasons, which induced him to remove from Watertown, are not stated. No indications of dissatisfaction on his part, or on the part of the people, are to be found.* Mr. Bailey has left on record, during his residence in Watertown, 39 marriages, 361 baptisms, and 117 admitted to the church.

The Rev. John Bailey was born near Blackburn in Lancashire, England, on the 24th of February, 1644. His mother was a woman of remarkable piety, and she early imbued his mind with a serious sense of God and of religion. An extraordinary instance is recorded of the happy effect of his youthful piety upon his father, who is represented to have been a licentious and profligate man. The mother one day called the family together, and persuaded her son John to pray with them. When the father returned probably from one of his haunts of vice, and was told of the affecting manner, in which the child had led the devotion of the household, he was smitten to the heart

the pulpit, pue-seats, and galleryes (the cushion I left as a token of my love), all my administrations, him that digs the graves, neighbouring towns and churches." What Mr. Bailey alludes to by "the three or four meetings in the town," I know not.

* A diary was kept by Mr. Daniel Fairfield of Braintree, from 1697 to 1711, with the following extract from which I have been furnished by the kindness of the Rev. and learned Dr. Harris of Dorchester. We learn from it, that depression of mind, and disease, were among the causes of Mr. Bailey's removal to Boston. "1697, Dec. 12th. Died in Boston the Rev. Mr. John Bailey, who for many years preached the Gospel of peace in the city of Limerick, in the kingdom of Ireland, but being persecuted and silenced he removed to N. E. 1684. He was highly honoured at his arrival, as he well deserved, being a more than ordinary lively preacher. He was for some years the officer of the Church in Watertown, where his wife died, and his dear brother Thomas, who was also a famous minister. Then, *being very melancholy and having the gout*, he moved to Boston about the year 1693. He preached in Boston at the South Church once a month, and at the Old Church almost every Sabbath, and his turn in the Lecture; till, falling sick last fall, he died as above written, and was honourably interred on the 16th day in the tomb of Mr. Thomas Deane."

by the touching circumstance. He became thoughtful and contrite, and proved at last a sincere, devoted Christian. Among the many encouraging evidences of the redeeming influence of maternal piety, there are few more impressive than this. Young Bailey, having received a good classical and general education, began to preach at the age of twenty-two. His first services in the ministry were at Chester. But he soon went over to Ireland, and about fourteen years of his residence in that country were spent at Limerick. There he labored with such an assiduous and self-sacrificing spirit, that he laid the foundation for that infirm state of health, from which he never afterward wholly recovered.* His fidelity was severely tried by such persecutions, as were the usual price of nonconformity at that time. He was more than once thrown into jail for attending the administration of the ordinances at private meetings. Persecution was not the only, nor perhaps the hardest, trial to which his constancy was exposed. An effort was made to draw him, by tempting promises, into the bosom of the Episcopal Church. While he was at Limerick, his ministry was attended by persons of distinction, who were related to the Duke of Ormond, the lord lieutenant of Ireland. This circumstance provoked his enemies not a little; and upon occasion of this excitement, the office of chaplain to the Duke of Ormond was offered to him, if he would conform, with the promise of a deanery immediately, and of a bishoprick so soon as a vacancy should occur. The man, whom it was thought expedient to silence by winning him over to the hierarchy at such a price, must have possessed no common influence. But severity and allurements were alike lost on him. He adhered to what he believed to be the cause of truth,

* Mather describes the abundant success of Bailey's ministry at Limerick, by saying, that "he seemed rather to fish with a net, than with an hook, for the kingdom of God."

unterrified and unseduced. He continued to preach and to labor with untiring earnestness, and soon became again the victim of the spirit of persecution. The irreproachable purity of his character afforded him no protection. The hardships of a long imprisonment were inflicted on him. In the course of his trial he said to his judges, "If I had been drinking, and gambling, and carousing at a tavern with my company, my lords, I presume that would not have procured my being treated thus as an offender. Must praying to God and preaching of Christ, with a company of Christians that are as peaceable, and inoffensive, and serviceable to his Majesty and the government, as any of his subjects, — must this be a greater crime?" And so far was common decency set at defiance, that the recorder replied, "We will have you to know that it is a greater crime." During his imprisonment, he was visited constantly by the members of his flock, to whom he continued to impart religious instruction, in such manner as his confinement would permit. He was finally released, upon giving a pledge that within a certain time he would leave the country. Mr. Bailey accordingly looked to New England, as the refuge of persecuted nonconformity. He and his brother came hither, probably in the year 1684. In that year he wrote a very earnest and affecting address "to his loving and dearly beloved Christian friends in and about Limerick." This was afterward printed at Boston in the same volume with sketches of some of his discourses, entitled "Man's Chief End to glorifie God, or Some brief Sermon-Notes on 1 Cor. x. 31." To this volume was prefixed an Address to the Reader, signed with the initials J. M. The writer of this prefatory address, whoever he was, remarks, that in publishing these pieces Mr. Bailey was "purely passive, utterly refusing (whether out of melancholy, modesty, or bodily infirmity I say not) to be any otherwise concerned than barely to allow of their publica-

tion.”* In 1692 Mr. Bailey preached the Artillery Election Sermon in Boston; but this discourse, I believe, was not published.

The distinguishing traits of Mr. Bailey's character were ardent piety, great tenderness of conscience, and an absorbing interest in the spiritual welfare of his fellow men. His religious sensibility was exceedingly keen and active; and it was his prayer (to use his own words) that “he might not be of the number of them, that live without love, speak without feeling, and act without life.” It is evident that his temperament was hypochondriacal, and that he had a strong habitual tendency to melancholy and despondence, — a state of mind, which was doubtless aggravated, if not caused, by the scenes he had passed through in Ireland, and by the miserable condition of his health. He delighted to urge powerful and heart-searching appeals upon the consciences of men, more than to

* This volume was printed by Samuel Green in 1689. I have read it with no little interest, partly for the good sense, but more for the warm and hearty feeling, which it displays. The farewell exhortation to the congregation in Limerick is peculiarly affectionate and pungent. It is written with remarkable simplicity and directness. To this circumstance Mr. Bailey himself alludes in the Postscript: “The plainness of its dress,” says he, “I take for granted will never offend you; for I only now write to you just as I used to preach to you, and talk with you. It is the *market language* that must save souls.” In speaking of leaving them, he remarks, “It hath been my resolution of old, rather to wear out than rust out; and it would quickly kill me to go on spending Sabbaths as of late I have done, and I suppose the offer of a thousand pound per annum, to lead such an idle life, would signifie little to me. Many offers and invitations have I had elsewhere; yea, to places that might seem at the first blush to please me; but for your sakes they were in vain, and took me up few thoughts.” Again; “The broadest seas cannot hinder the mutual visits of our prayers: though we may never meet more betwixt these old pleasant walls of the Abby (which grieves my very soul, to turn my back on), yet let us often meet at the Throne of Grace,” &c. Further he remarks, “Conversion hath been the business of my life these twenty years: by conversion I do not mean turning men to an opinion, but from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. You have often heard me say, that I had rather turn one to Jesus Christ, than ten to my opinion.” It is to be wished, that this noble sentiment were more heeded amidst the religious strife of the present day. The “Sermon-Notes,” likewise, are full of solemn counsels, good thoughts, and apt illustrations.

address the understanding, or to administer the consolations of Christianity; "chusing rather," as he said of himself, "to convert one sinner, than to comfort ten saints." His sermons were not so much didactic or argumentative, as hortatory and exciting; and he seems to have thought it far the most important part of his duty, as a preacher, to bring the awful considerations connected with the sanctions of religion to bear on his hearers with stirring power. But he dealt as severely, at least, with his own heart, as with the hearts of others; and the rigorous standard, to which he brought his feelings and conduct, may be seen in the extracts preserved from his diary. His services were much sought, and highly valued, both in Boston* and Watertown. That minister must be considered a happy man, who at the last hour has as little reason, as had Mr. Bailey, to reproach himself with the want of fidelity and devotedness to duty.†

Mr. Gibbs was now the only clergyman in the town, and was engaged from time to time, but not ordained.‡

* John Dunton, in the curious account of his visit to Boston, has recorded the following notice of the Baileys: "I went next to visit Mr. John and Mr. Thomas Baily. These two are popular preachers, and very generous to strangers. I heard Mr. John upon these words, — '*looking unto Jesus*,'— and I thought he spake like an angel. They express a more than ordinary kindness to Mr. Wilkins, my landlord, and (being persecuted in Limerick for their nonconformity) came over with him from Ireland. Reader, I might be large in their character; but when I tell you they are true pictures of Dr. Annesly (whom they count a second St. Paul) 'tis as high as I need go." *Life & Errours*. Vol. I. p. 95.

† See Appendix F. Mather preached the funeral sermon of John Bailey, and in that has given many particulars of his life: *Magnal.* Book iii. Chap. 7. See also Middleton's *Evangelical Biography*, Vol. IV. p. 101.; Emerson's *History of the First Church*, p. 146.; Eliot, and Allen. Dr. Eliot has fallen into an error in speaking of Thomas Bailey as if he were the stated minister of Watertown, and in saying that John "only preached occasionally there." John Bailey was the principal and stated minister of the town: his brother was only an assistant, and had a short ministry.

‡ About this time an order was passed by the town, providing that certain persons named "shall the next Sabbath day, and after, as they shall see reason, gather the contribution, and out of it satisfie the minister, keeping an account what every person contributes."

That ever-fruitful source of dissension in a village, the erection of a new meeting-house, began at this period to kindle strife among the inhabitants of Watertown. We have already seen, that thirty-eight years before this time some movements had been made towards providing a new place of worship. After Mr. Bailey's removal to Boston, the subject was called up afresh. In 1692, the Selectmen passed an order, that on the 18th of November, the people should be assembled in order to fix upon such a place for this purpose, as should be "most convenient for the bulk of the inhabitants." At this meeting nothing was effected. Some were earnest to change their place of worship, and others equally earnest to have it remain where it was. Neither party was disposed to yield; and in this dilemma the Selectmen agreed to refer the matter to the governor of the province, Sir William Phipps, and the Council, requesting them to appoint a committee to investigate and settle the difficulty. The town concurred in this measure, and declared, "that they would sit down by the determination of that committee." This mode of bringing the disputes of a town to an issue, by referring them to the magistrates of the State, would be deemed singular indeed at the present day; but it seems then to have been not uncommon. The proposed committee was appointed by the Governor and Council. It consisted of William Stoughton, John Phillips, James Russell, Samuel Sewall, and Joseph Lynde, names of high reputation in the affairs of the province at that time. They made a report on the 18th of May, 1693. The Selectmen, to whom it was sent, were dissatisfied with some particulars in it, and designated certain persons to wait on the committee, and treat with them on these points. After a conference with these persons, a majority of the committee acknowledged that it was necessary to amend their report in some respects, and requested to have it left with them for that purpose.

They took ample time for revising it ; for it was not returned and made known to the town till April 17th, 1694.*

This report, notwithstanding the high source from which it came, did not allay the prevalent excitement. A protest against it was put on record, and signed by about 120 names. They utterly refused to bear any part of the expense of building a meeting-house in the place recommended by the committee, but declared at the same time that if a house of worship should be erected in the west part of the town, so as to be convenient for "the Farmers,"† they would gladly "be helpful therein." It is remarkable that the protest denies that the town had ever requested the interference of the magistrates in this matter, notwithstanding that a vote to that effect is on record. On the appearance of this opposition, the Selectmen applied to the committee to know whether they would "stand by their advice," or had any thing to say about the protest. It does not appear that any answer was received. But the building of the new house on the proposed spot proceeded in defiance of the opposition. It was finished, and on the 4th of February, 1696, it was accepted, by a vote of the town, as the place of public worship, "according to the advice and determination of the honoured Committee."

The town was now considered as divided into three parts, namely, the East end, the Middle part, and the Farmers, or the West end. The abovementioned dispute was principally between the two first of these. It was soon determined by vote, that the new meeting-house should in future be the place for all public town meetings. Unhappily, the heated state of feeling seems not to have abated for a considerable time, and

* See Appendix G.

† By this title were designated those, who inhabited that part of the town which afterward became Weston, and its vicinity. Among the protestors on this occasion, thirty-three were of "the Farmers," whose names are placed separately from the rest.

its influence was seen in occasional disorders attending the management of public affairs. On the 26th of June, 1696, the town determined that "a day of humiliation" should be observed. The Rev. Samuel Willard and the Rev. Cotton Mather, both of Boston, were requested to fix upon a time for this purpose, and to perform the religious services of the occasion.

Meanwhile repeated invitations had been given to Mr. Gibbs to become the minister of the town. These he so far accepted as to officiate stately in the old meeting-house; but there was, as yet, no permanent settlement. In the summer of 1693, he was, it seems, residing in Boston; for at that time the metropolis was visited with an infectious and fatal distemper, which compelled many of the inhabitants to remove into the country;* and on this occasion, we learn from the records, that the people of Watertown, fearing Mr. Gibbs would remove to so great a distance that they should not be able to enjoy his services, voted to transport his goods and to establish him among themselves in the house built for the minister. His engagements were renewed, at short intervals, by special applications; and this circumstance, with some others, may lead us to infer, that Mr. Gibbs consented to the arrangement somewhat cautiously and reluctantly. If so, it was probably owing to the divided and unquiet state of the town at that time. During the progress of the dispute, he had been repeatedly requested to engage himself for the new meeting-house, when it should be completed. No answer to these invitations is on record; but when the new house was at length finished, he decisively refused to transfer his services to that place, on account, as he said, of the great dissatisfaction in the minds of many with regard to the several votes that had been passed. Accordingly he remained with the

* For the occasion of this sickness see Hutchinson, Vol. II. p. 71.

East part of the town ; and those who belonged to the new place of worship were left to seek another clergyman. From Mr. Gibbs's general character, and from the caution manifested in his conduct, it is to be presumed that he acted from a sense of duty in this case.

Measures were soon taken to procure a minister for the new meeting-house. The church gave notice to the Selectmen, that having met for that purpose on the 28th of August, 1696, and having chosen the Rev. Samuel Angier for their pastor, they requested a meeting of the town for concurrence. A meeting was holden September 28th, and the town voted to co-operate in giving a call to Mr. Angier to the work of the ministry among them.* Previously to this, on the 21st of September, there had been a meeting for debate and compromise. Persons had been appointed by the East end, and by the Middle part of the town, respectively, to discuss their interests, and reconcile, if possible, their contending claims. Proposals were made by each party ; but they were uniformly rejected by their opponents. They parted, each more strongly convinced than ever, of the injustice of the claims of the other.

Mr. Angier accepted the invitation, and was inducted into office May 25th, 1697. The Rev. Mr. Easterbrook of Concord had been chosen by the church "to give the pastoral charge, and to be the mouth and moderator of the church in the publick

* Here for the first time in our records the church is mentioned as acting separately from the town in the preliminaries to the settlement of a minister. This practice was not always adhered to after this time in Watertown. At the present day it is, in many places, entirely abandoned, the whole society acting as one body in giving a call. And that the usage of ancient times was not always in favor of the distinct and separate power of the church in this affair, is evident from the statement of Mather, that "many people would not allow the church any privilege to go before them in the choice of a pastor. The clamour is, *we must maintain him.*" *Ratio Disciplina*, p. 16. The *clamour*, as Mather calls it, was not very unreasonable, one would think.

management of the whole affair." A committee had been appointed to treat with other ministers "for their assistance in the settlement of Mr. Angier;" but a provision was made, that if their assistance could not be obtained, the church would proceed without it. It was not obtained; and Mr. Easterbrook was the only clergyman, who appeared at the ceremony of Mr. Angier's settlement. He presided in the business of the occasion; "with much gravity and seriousness gave a most solemn and Scriptural charge to Mr. Samuel Angier, and concluded by recommending the whole to the favour and blessing of God." The public exercises of prayer and preaching were performed by Mr. Angier.* For what reasons the ministers who were invited refused to attend, we cannot now discover; but probably they either judged the proceedings of the Middle part of the town to be improper, or they were unwilling to have any concern in a transaction which had been preceded by so much dissension. Mr. Angier had been ordained before, and settled in another place; and in proceeding to his installation without the assistance of other churches, which, as a matter of custom and Christian friendship, had been solicited, and refused, his church manifested an independence worthy of praise, and in conformity with the provisions of the Cambridge Platform.

At this time, Mr. Gibbs had not been ordained; so that Mr. Angier was the only regularly settled clergyman in the town. An attempt was made to unite them in the work of the ministry. July 2d, 1697, a meeting of "the two precincts"† was held, at which

* These particulars are taken from a book of records kept at that time by the church at the new meeting-house. This book was committed to the Rev. Warham Williams, Mr. Angier's successor, by his son, the Rev. John Angier of Bridgewater, and is now in the hands of the Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham, as constituting a part of the records of his church. It contains little, except the particulars about the call and settlement of Mr. Angier.

† This term, used to designate the different parts of the town, here occurs for the first time in the records.

Mr. Gibbs was invited to become an assistant to Mr. Angier in the new place of worship. Of this proposal Mr. Angier expressed in writing his entire approbation. No answer to the application on the part of Mr. Gibbs is on record. It is to be presumed, that he refused to concur in the proposed measure.

In the mean time, the inhabitants of that section of Watertown, which was afterward called Weston, appear to have had a separate interest of their own in ecclesiastical matters. October 2d, 1694, a vote was passed as follows: "Our neighbours, the Farmers, being upon endeavours to have a meeting-house among themselves, the town consents that they may come as far as Beaver Brook* upon the county road leading to Sudbury," &c. Nothing however seems to have been done at that time in consequence of this vote. February 1st, 1697, "the Farmers" were by vote released from all obligations to pay ministerial rates in the town, "any further" (as it is expressed) "than by way of contribution when and so often as they come to hear the word preached; because they live so remote that they cannot come without much difficulty to the meeting-house in the town, but do commonly at present go to other towns which are nearer, and do contribute there towards the support of the ministry where they go to hear the word." It is also mentioned as a reason for the exemption, that they would probably soon have a house of worship and a minister of their own. That part of Watertown had indeed now become, in every thing but legal form, a distinct precinct, and orders were passed from time to time in public meetings for settling its boundaries. On the 16th of March, 1698, a tax of two hundred and ninety-five pounds, to defray the expenses of the meeting-house recently erected in

* The name of this brook is still retained, and familiarly known. It was given by Gov. Winthrop and his attendants, "because the beavers had shorn down divers great trees there, and made divers dams across the brook." At the same time Master's Brook and Mount Feake were named. See Winthrop, Vol. I. p. 68.

the Middle part, was assessed upon all the inhabitants, "the Farmers only excepted, because they *have built* a meeting-house more convenient for themselves." The house here referred to was then in progress, but was not sufficiently finished to be used for religious services till March, 1700. In the interval, the people in this part of Watertown had chosen their officers, and acted as a distinct parish. Mr. Thomas Symms, Mr. Joseph Mors, Mr. Nathaniel Gookin, Mr. Thomas Tufts, and Mr. William Williams were successively called to the work of the ministry among them, before they were entirely separated from Watertown. In January, 1713, this precinct was in due form incorporated, as a distinct town, by the name of Weston.* The people of Watertown consented to this separation on certain specified conditions, one of which was, that "the Farmers" should still be bound, as before, to pay their proportion in the expense of repairing or rebuilding the bridge over Charles River.

To return to the ecclesiastical affairs of the two societies in Watertown. The attempt to unite them was, as we have seen, ineffectual. The East part now took measures to have their clergyman formally and permanently inducted into the pastoral office. In Judge Sewall's manuscripts,† the following record, relating to this subject, is found: "October 6, 1697. A church is gathered at Watertown East End, and Mr. Gibbs ordained. Mr. Fox ordains, Mr. Sherman gives the Right Hand of Fellowship. This was done in the afternoon in the open aer, tho' a cold day.

* For some remarks on the precise date of this incorporation, and for the history of Weston subsequently, see Dr. Kendal's Century Sermon, January 12, 1813.

† Chief Justice Sewall, here and before mentioned, was a man of high reputation, and is said to have been an intimate friend of the Rev. Mr. Gibbs. He was great-grandfather of the late Chief Justice Sewall of Massachusetts, and died January 1st, 1730, aged 78. The manuscripts, from which extracts are often taken, were journals of such occurrences in his times as seemed to him worthy of notice, and frequently afford valuable information.

The Western party, having the Select-Men on their side, got possession of the Meeting-house, and would not suffer the assembly to enter there. The Lord be mercifull to his people, pardon our sins, and heal our gaping Wounds!" Of the disorderly conduct here alluded to, one of the effects of the lamentable strife which had prevailed, I find no other notice.

Difficulties soon arose concerning the support of public worship. In 1700, the government of the province, probably in consequence of some petition, interposed, and passed a resolve on the subject. In 1712, the town was assembled to hear the advice of the General Court, which was issued on the 4th of November in that year; and they then expressed their desire to maintain the public worship of God according to the rules of the court in 1700, but said nothing about the advice of 1712. At another meeting on the 4th of May, 1713, they determined that it was improper for the town, as such, to act upon the advice and direction of the Court, but that each congregation must act upon it separately. Soon after, however, there was a vote, at a general meeting of the town, to submit to the advice of the Court. Still an attempt was made to disturb the arrangement, which had thus been agreed upon, and the East precinct entered on record an earnest protest against any such attempt. It was long before the strife, awakened by this subject, was entirely appeased. The salaries of Mr. Angier and Mr. Gibbs, it appears, were both paid from the common treasury. Although an effort was made by the East congregation to effect a division into two distinct townships, it was unsuccessful, and the two parts continued, as before, one town.*

The foot bridge, which had for many years been the only one over Charles River in Watertown, having gone to decay so much as to give occasion for complaints against the town, a question arose at a public meeting

* See Appendix H.

on the 5th of September, 1718, whether it were better to repair the old bridge, or to build a new one in the same or another place. A committee was appointed to consider the question. They reported, that "to repair the old bridge or build another in the same place will be labour lost, or money sent down stream in a very little time." They then advised to build one at a place somewhat further up the river. This report was accepted; and furthermore the town voted, that they were desirous that the proposed bridge "should be a good and sufficient *cart* bridge for the accommodating the public, and especially some particular towns." This however was considered so great an enterprise, that they would not consent to undertake it without the assurance of assistance from the public; "the charge thereof being," as they express it, "unavoidably great, far greater than Watertown and Weston can bear of themselves." They applied to the General Court for help in the affair, with what success does not appear. In January, 1719, the town entered into contract with Mr. Thomas Learned and Capt. Thomas Prentice to build the proposed bridge under the superintendence of a committee appointed for that purpose, and voted to give them £160 for it. Besides this, they were to have what they could obtain from the other towns that were interested in the undertaking. This bridge seems to have been regarded as the common cause of nearly all the towns west of Watertown, and with some reason, for a very great proportion of the people from that quarter passed the river at this point, and went to Boston over Roxbury Neck. Capt. Prentice and Mr. Learned built the bridge faithfully, according to the terms of their contract, and at the same place where our bridge is at present. But when they had finished their engagement, they found themselves losers by it, and petitioned the town, through the Selectmen, for compensation or relief. In this petition, dated November 6th, 1721, they acknowledged, that the money promised

by stipulation had been honestly paid," but complained that "the bounty from other towns was far less than what they might reasonably expect, considering the great benefit they receive thereby." The consideration of their petition was deferred, in order that they might bring in an exact account of their expenses and receipts. Such an account they presented, by which it appeared that the bridge had cost £309. 17s. 11d., and that they had received from Watertown, Weston, and some other towns and private persons, the sum of £184. 15s. 11d., leaving the amount of their loss £125. 2s. At the next town meeting, the petition was again taken up, and again deferred, and finally appears not to have been acted upon at all. Thus was completed the first bridge for wheel-carriages in the town about 110 years ago. The place of the bridge, it is believed, has remained the same from that time to this. Within the memory of some now living, the bridge was so narrow that only one carriage could pass at a time. When we consider how common and trifling an affair it is deemed to build such a bridge now, we are amused to see how great and even perilous an enterprise it was thought to be when first undertaken. But it should be remembered, that the contrast between their ability for such a work, and ours, is at least equally striking.

The Rev. Samuel Angier died on the 21st of January, 1719, aged 64, and was buried in a grave-yard now belonging to Waltham. He was the son of Edmund Angier of Cambridge, and was born in that town March 17th, 1655. He was a descendant, on the maternal side, from the celebrated Dr. William Ames of England, author of "*Medulla Theologiæ*." He was graduated at Harvard College in 1673, and was ordained at Rehoboth, October 19th, 1679. From this place he was dismissed, and afterward settled in Watertown as before mentioned. Of his character and ability as a clergyman, I know not that any account is to be found. There are however many evidences, that he was

highly esteemed by the people of his charge. During his ministry in Watertown, which lasted nearly twenty-two years, he received into the church 95 members, and baptized 706 persons. He has very often, but erroneously, been considered as minister of Waltham.* The mistake will be obvious, if we remember that Waltham was not incorporated till nearly twenty years after his death; although when it was incorporated, it included most of the society over which he had been settled. His son, the Rev. John Angier, was the first minister of the East parish in Bridgewater; and a daughter of his was married to the Rev. John Shaw, minister of the South parish in Bridgewater.

The efforts made to compose the difficulties existing in the town seem, for the most part, to have resulted in mutual complaints, rather than in any approximation to a good understanding. May 13th, 1715, it was voted to build a "new meeting-house in some convenient place, where it may accommodate the inhabitants of the most westerly part of the town better than either of the other meeting-houses do that are already erected"; and the next year a committee was chosen to fix upon a spot for that purpose. This was after the incorporation of Weston; of course, "the westerly part," here spoken of, must mean what is now Waltham. The inhabitants of this part, it would seem, might have been well accommodated at the new meeting-house already erected in the middle of the town, which was much nearer to them than the old one; and as the town had now two places of worship, the support of which was the cause of much trouble, if not burdensome, it is not easily to be explained why they should wish for a third.

* Thus Mr. Farmer, in his valuable "Genealogical Register," says, that Mr. Angier was "installed at Waltham," and in the Index to the 2d Series of Hist. Coll. he is referred to as minister of *Waltham*. The place where Mr. Angier's meeting-house stood is even now (after the separation of Waltham) within the bounds of Watertown. The house, in which he lived, is said to have been that now occupied by Mr. James Gillpatrick, opposite the widow Harrington's.

The plan, however, was not carried into effect for several years ; indeed never in its original form.

After the death of Mr. Angier, the western congregation continued to maintain preaching, and employed several individuals at different times to supply their pulpit. Among these are mentioned the names of Mr. Timothy Minut, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Robert Sturgeon.

A definite division between the eastern and western parts of the town was, at length, found necessary. November 19th, 1720, the General Court, on application from the inhabitants of Watertown, appointed a committee* to run a dividing line between the two precincts, and to decide on the expediency of removing either or both of the meeting-houses to such places, I suppose, as should be more central to their respective congregations, when the proposed boundaries should be fixed. This committee made a report the next month, which was accepted. Samuel Thaxter, Esq. was directed by an order of the Court, in conformity with the report, to run the line between the two precincts. This he did, and a notice of his doings was entered in the town records. The line is described as beginning on Charles River, proceeding "on a north course forty-nine degrees east," and terminating at the southwestern bounds of that part of Cambridge which is now called West Cambridge. The committee likewise decided, that within two years the new 'or west meeting-house should be removed to a rising ground near the house of Nathaniel Livermore, which, I believe, was in the vicinity of the place where the Rev. Mr. Ripley's meeting-house in Waltham now stands, and that within ten years, the old, or east meeting-house should be removed to an eminence called *School-house Hill*,†

* This committee was composed of Isaac Winslow, John Cushing, and Samuel Thaxter, of the Council ; and John Clark, William Dudley, John Chandler, and William Throop, of the House of Representatives.

† The hill here mentioned bore this name for a long time. It is now called *Meeting-house Hill*, and is immediately behind our present place of worship. It is the highest point of land within the limits of Watertown.

or, that in each of the places thus designated a new house of worship should be erected. With the order of the General Court, issued in consequence of this report, the town voted to comply. But, from the doings of "the easterly congregation," which were placed on record by their request, it would seem that they entertained suspicions of some collusion on the part of their western neighbours, or of a disposition to thwart the course of proceeding recommended in the report.

Nothing of this kind, however, was attempted. Ecclesiastical councils were called, and gave their advice on the occasion ; and both parts of the town soon took measures to accomplish the object designated in the order of the Court. Besides granting money, to be raised by a levy, they appropriated to this purpose the town's proportion of the 50,000 pounds of bills of credit issued by the government.* The western precinct made proposals for the new meeting-house (that, in which Mr. Angier had officiated,) in order to remove it to the spot which they were directed to occupy ; but they could not obtain it. They next appointed a committee to treat for the purchase of the Newton meeting-house, which was then to be sold. This purchase was effected, for not more than eighty pounds. The materials of the building were transported to the appointed place, and there set up anew. This was in 1721. On the 14th of August in the next year, this part of the town invited Mr. William Welsted to be their minister. But he declined the invitation, and was afterward settled at the Old North Church in Boston. They next applied (December 18th, 1722) to Mr. Warham Williams, who accepted their call, and was ordained June 11th, 1723. He was a son of the Rev. John Williams of Deerfield, Mass., and in his

* The Act for this purpose was passed in 1720. See "Acts and Laws of the General Court and Assembly of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, &c. Anno Regis Georgii Septimo."

childhood was, with the rest of his father's family, in captivity among the Indians in Canada for two or three years.* He died June 22d, 1751, aged 52.

The eastern precinct likewise proceeded, on their part, to comply with the direction of the Court. Several meetings were held, in which it was determined to erect a house for public worship on the height of land, which (as before observed) was then called *School-house Hill*; and measures were adopted accordingly. This part of the town, as well as the western part, endeavoured to purchase the new or middle meeting-house, choosing rather to remove this, if it could be had, than to build a new one: but their proposal for this purpose, like the other, failed of success. Accordingly, on the 14th of January, 1723, they voted to build a new house for worship on the hill before specified, leaving the dimensions of the building to be settled by a committee, providing only that it should not be less than 50 feet long and 40 feet wide. The object of this vote was to be effected within twelve months; and though no notice is taken of the completion of the work, yet doubtless it was finished within that time. It appears, that in consequence of the extraordinary expense, which the town was now obliged to incur, the minister of the eastern parish, Mr. Gibbs, relinquished a certain amount of the salary which was due to him.

Watertown was now regularly divided into two distinct parishes, the eastern and the western, each of which had erected a new meeting-house. This was a preliminary step to the final separation of the two parishes into distinct towns; for several years, however, they remained together, as one town. In what manner the society, to which Mr. Angier had ministered, disposed of their meeting-house, we are not informed. They had refused to sell it to either of the two precincts when application was made for it. The society,

* An account of this captivity, in detail, may be found in "The Redeemed Captive returning to Zion."

it is probable, finding themselves too feeble to exist separately, were gradually dispersed and joined themselves to the other two parishes. Their meeting-house being abandoned was, we may presume, in the course of a few years demolished. It appears, however, that for some time they acted as a distinct church and society, and that their proceedings were thought to be irregular and censurable. That this was the fact, I infer from a vote recorded by Mr. Gibbs's successor concerning a Mr. Daniel Whitney, in which it is mentioned, as an offence, that he "owned the covenant among and submitted himself to the watch and discipline of those who acted as a third church in Watertown, and that he had a child baptized by Mr. Robert Sturgeon after the result of the council of churches met at Watertown on May 1st, 1722." *

The Rev. Henry Gibbs died on the 21st of October, 1723, having just entered on the 56th year of his age, and the 27th year of his ministry, reckoned from the date of his ordination. He was buried on the 24th of October, in the old grave-yard in Watertown. His father was Mr. Robert Gibbs,† a merchant of Boston, whose family was of Dorsetshire, England. Mr. Henry

* Of the Council here mentioned I find no other notice. Mr. Sturgeon was (as before noticed) one of those who supplied the pulpit after Mr. Angier's death. Persons are living, who remember to have heard him spoken of as having been one of the clergymen in the town.

† Mr. Robert Gibbs was a gentleman of large property, and of considerable distinction, in Boston. His house is mentioned by Josselyn, who, describing Boston in 1663, says: "The buildings are handsome, joining one to another as in London, with many large streets, most of them paved with pebble stone: in the high street towards the Common there are fair buildings, some of stone, and at the east end of the town one among the rest, built by the shore, by Mr. Gibbs, a merchant, being a stately edifice, which it is thought will stand him in little less than £3000 before it be fully finished." *New England's Rarities Discovered*, p. 1 & 2. In the time of Sir Edmund Andros, this house was once occupied by soldiers, according to Judge Sewall, who records as follows: "1686, Dec. 24. About 60 Red-Coats are brought to town, landed at Mr. Pool's wharf, where drew up, and so marched to Mr. Gibbs's house at Fort Hill." There was a wharf called by Mr. Gibbs's name in that part of Boston where he lived.

Gibbs was graduated at Harvard College in 1685, and in June 1692 was married to Miss Mercy Greenough. His situation at Watertown must have been, in many respects, difficult and trying amidst the strife with which the town was agitated, during a considerable part of his ministry. But it reflects no little honor on his firmness, prudence, and good sense, that he seems to have been held in high respect by all the inhabitants of the town, even by those who abandoned the old place of worship, to which he was attached. No complaint or reproach appears against him, in the midst of transactions which usually make it difficult for a clergyman to escape censure. This was not the result of calculating policy, or selfish pliancy of disposition on his part, but of real kindness of feeling and simple rectitude of conduct. There can be no doubt that he was a devoted and faithful minister. His services were able and highly valued by his own parish, and among the neighbouring churches. Without any pretension to what are commonly considered great or shining qualities, he had, what is far better, sound sense, warm piety, and a well-directed zeal in doing good. Of his peculiarities and habits of life it is not easy, after the lapse of more than a century, to learn much. Tradition has preserved among his descendants the amusing, though trivial particular, that he was accustomed to write his sermons on the bellows in the chimney corner. The strange and melancholy infatuation about witchcraft prevailed in his time; and of some of the scenes connected with this delusion he had an opportunity of being an eye-witness. His feelings on one of these occasions he recorded in the following passages in his diary; and while they intimate the superstitious misgivings, to which he in common with others yielded, they show at least that he was capable of holding his mind in suspense on the subject, which was a degree of moderation and good judgment not very common at that period, even among intelligent men: "1692, 30th

May. This day I travelled to Salem. 31st. I spent this day at Salem Village to attend the publick examination of criminals (witches), and observe remarkable and prodigious passages therein. Wonder'd at what I saw, but how to judge and conclude I am at a loss: to affect my heart, and induce me to more care and concernedness about myself and others, is the use I should make of it." Mr. Gibbs was a benefactor both to his church and to the College. In his Will, which was proved November 11th, 1723, he made the following bequest, part of which still constitutes a portion of what is called *the ministerial fund*: "I do give and bequeath to the Eastern Church of Christ in Watertown, to which I have borne a pastoral relation, for the encouragement of the gospel ministry there, my four acres of pasture land and three acres of marsh, situate in the East end of said town, for the use of the said church for ever. And I do give to said Church my silver bowl with a foot." His legacy to the College he devised in the following terms: "And further it is my will, that within two years after my youngest child comes of age, an hundred pounds be paid by my heirs for the use of Harvard College, forty pounds thereof by my son, and twenty pounds apiece by my daughters; the yearly interests to be exhibited to such members of the College as need it, firstly to my children's posterity if they desire it."

The writings of Mr. Gibbs bear a creditable testimony to his talents, piety, and sobriety of judgment. They have that natural and direct character, which indicates that the author's chief desire was to do good. While they are free from all affectation of style and extravagance of feeling, they breathe the warm and tender spirit that is so well suited for the purposes of edification. In 1721 he published a treatise entitled "The certain Blessedness of all those, whose Sins are forgiven, considered, confirmed and applyed, from Psalm xxxii. 1, 2. Boston: printed by S. Kneeland

for D. Henchman." It consists of a number of discourses condensed together in a systematical form. For this book a preface was written by the Rev. Benjamin Wadsworth, at that time minister of the First Church in Boston, and afterward president of Harvard College, who remarks, "The worthy Author of these Sermons needs no commendation in a preface; being justly most valued by those to whom he is most known." A little volume, full of affectionate and practical counsels, was gathered from Mr. Gibbs's papers, and published after his death, with the title, "Godly Children their Parents Joy; exhibited in several Sermons &c., Boston: printed by S. Kneeland & T. Green for D. Henchman. 1727." The preface was written by Dr. Colman of the Church in Brattle Square, Boston.* In 1704 Mr. Gibbs preached the Artillery Election Sermon: it was published with a title of somewhat formidable length, as follows; "The Right Method of Safety, or the Just Concern of the

*Dr. Colman expresses his opinion of the book as follows: "But I forget that I am only writing a preface, and that but to a small book, and a very good one that needs nothing of mine to be added to it. The good people of Watertown, who press'd me to this service, will, I hope, easily forgive me the length I have gone; and having shown this respect to the labours and memory of their deceased pastor as to send this posthumous piece to the press, I trust they will now treasure it up in their hearts, put it into the hands of their households, and teach it diligently to their children, for whom, as well as for themselves, it is well adapted to make saving impressions, if God add his blessing. The very virtuous children of the deceased author will not need to be exhorted to receive these instructions of their father with a double-reverence, and teach their children after them *to rise up and call him blessed*. Yea I will presume to add my wish, that the students at Cambridge (where the learned author was so well known and honour'd while he lived) would wear this little book about them, and make it a *Vade mecum*; study the plain and easy rules of it, and weigh well the powerful and strong motives in it; till their whole soul receive the rich leven of it, and they go into that wisdom taught in it, which will render 'em the joy and crown as well of their country, as of their parents. Such are the sermons here commended to you; and such sermons as these, in the ordinary course of preaching, will give a man character and praise eno' in the churches of Christ, as a wise and faithful pastor, and as a judicious and learned preacher. To say more of the gifts of one of the most modest and retired men while he liv'd would be to offer some kind of violence to him now he is dead."

People of God to join a due Trust in Him with a diligent Use of Means. As it was propounded in a Sermon preached at Boston to the Artillery Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, on the 5th of June, 1704, being the Day for their Election of Officers." The text was Psalm xlv. 6.* These, I believe, are the only published productions of Mr. Gibbs's pen. He is said to have had a turn for poetry; and a specimen of it is appended to a manuscript collection of his sermons, now in the library of the Essex Historical Society. It is an "Attempt at Versification on the Word of God," in twenty-four stanzas, and manifests the piety much more than the poetical gifts of the writer.†

The records kept by Mr. Gibbs are defective, extending only from 1697 to 1703. During this time, the number of his admissions to the church was 31, of marriages 21, and of baptisms 143.

January 14th, 1723, a committee was chosen by the town to address the General Court for the purpose of obtaining "the 2000 acres of upland and 1500 acres of meadow formerly granted to Watertown, and not yet taken up." It does not appear when, or for what purpose, this grant had been made. The land,

* Judge Sewall has recorded that, in 1720, he "propounded Mr. Gibbs for election preacher." This refers to the General Election; but the proposal seems to have been unsuccessful, for Mr. Gibbs never preached the sermon on that occasion.

† For many of the above particulars concerning Mr. Gibbs I am indebted to the politeness of one of his descendants, Mr. William Gibbs of Salem, a diligent and careful antiquarian. It should also be mentioned that Mr. Josiah W. Gibbs, Professor of Sacred Literature in Yale College, and distinguished as an Oriental scholar and Biblical critic, is among the descendants of this minister of Watertown. His daughter, Margaret, was the wife of the Rev. Dr. Appleton of Cambridge: she was married June 25th, 1719, and died January 17th, 1771. He had a son William, who was drowned in Charles River in Cambridge, where he was at school, August, 1715; of which event Judge Sewall has taken notice in his MSS. In a list of the eminent ministers of New England, made by the Rev. John Barnard of Marblehead, the name of Mr. Gibbs of Watertown is placed in the second class. Hist. Coll. 1st Series, Vol. X. p. 170. See Appendix I.

if obtained, was to be divided between Watertown and Weston, according to the proportion of each in the Province Tax. Their right to this grant, it would seem, had become obsolete, or was disputed; for they speak of recovering it, in the records of the town meetings of 1725 and 1726, in which the subject comes up again more than once. They made but slow progress in gaining the attention or consent of the Court to their petition. But that finally they did succeed, in part at least, we learn from the fact, that in August, 1728, persons were appointed "to seek out and survey the 2000 acres of land granted to Watertown and Weston," and likewise to procure a plan, or sketch, of the land under the hand of the surveyor, to be presented to the General Court, at their next session, for their confirmation. The next year, a proposal to sell the town's right in these 2000 acres was rejected by vote. In connexion with the abovementioned petition, it was voted (March 14th, 1726,) "to address the General Court for a suitable tract of land *to settle their young people on.*" About ten years afterward (December 1st, 1735), the representative of the town was instructed to bring the subject again before the Court, and to ask for a township, out of the unappropriated land of the Province, to furnish a settlement *for their youth*, "for such reasons as may justly be offered." How cogent these reasons were, we cannot judge; for they are not stated. The necessity, whether real or imaginary, for such a petition, implies that the young men of the town were supposed to have become too numerous to find room at home; but why a special provision was necessary to procure a settlement for them, instead of leaving them to take care of themselves, it is difficult to discover.

The successor of Mr. Gibbs in the ministry of the Eastern parish was the Rev. Seth Storer, who was ordained July 22d, 1724. Of the proceedings in relation to his settlement nothing is said in the town

records, since it was a concern belonging only to the precinct.*

In January, 1731, the representative of the town was directed to petition the General Court "to demolish the great bridge over Charles River in Cambridge, and to erect a ferry in lieu thereof, under such regulations as they shall see meet." The occasion or reasons for this petition are not assigned. It may be conjectured that the obstruction of navigation was the grievance, of which the Watertown people complained; if so, their business on the river must at this time have been of considerable amount. A vote was passed in 1734, to ask of the Court a grant of some of the unappropriated land belonging to the Province, "to enable them to support the bridge over Charles River in Watertown"; and it should be mentioned here, that about twenty years before this time they had applied to the Court for an order to have this bridge maintained at the expense of the whole county of Middlesex. These applications were doubtless unsuccessful. In 1734, also, another petition to the General Court was agreed upon, the object of which was to obtain a grant of land "to enable Watertown the better to support the two grammar schools in the town." This request, I presume, likewise failed of success. In order, as it would seem, to effect the same object (partially at least) in another way, certain tracts of land, lying by the highways and belonging to the town, were sold; and in March, 1735, a vote was passed to create, out of the money accruing from these sales, a stock or fund, the interest of which should be annually appropriated "for the support of the Grammar and English schools in the town." Whether this fund was in fact ever constituted, or, if so, how it was afterward dis-

* The following is Mr. Storer's own notice of his settlement, in the book of church records: "I was called to the work of the ministry by the church and congregation in the Easterly precinct in Watertown on February 3d, 1723-4, and was solemnly set apart for that work by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the presbytery on July 22d, 1724."

posed of, are questions which I suppose we have no means of settling. There is no such school fund in existence at the present time.

An ineffectual attempt was made by the Western precinct, in 1731, to obtain an incorporation, as a separate township. In April of that year, at a meeting of both precincts, agents were appointed to appear before the General Court in opposition to the attempt, and to show reason why the prayer of the petitioners should not be granted. An incorporation was not effected till seven years after this time.

A meeting of the town was called on the 10th of September, 1731, "to hear the representation of the honorable House of Representatives relating to the publick estate of the affairs of this Province now laboured under, which representation is recommended to the several towns by said House, for their serious consideration: and for the town to give their advice or directions with relation to said affairs laboured under." At the time here specified, the great and engrossing topic of public interest was the discussion between Governor Belcher and the House, concerning the support of the governor by a fixed salary; and to this subject, or to some question growing out of it, the representation mentioned in the above statement probably referred. It does not appear by the records, that the people of Watertown took any measures whatever in relation to the subject.

The jurisdiction, or at least the advice, of the Provincial government seems to have been extended not only to meeting-houses, but to school-houses. In 1733, certain measures were recommended by the House of Representatives, to which the town gave their consent, for the purpose of having two school-houses, and employing two schoolmasters.

In 1734, a singular and somewhat amusing interruption of traffic, amounting to a sort of act of non-intercourse, took place between Watertown and the

metropolis. There had been, till this time, no established and regular market in Boston ; but in the spring of 1734 measures were adopted to provide three places for this purpose in parts of the town distant from each other.* What there was in this proceeding, or in the arrangements connected with it, that gave offence to the country towns, we are not told. But, from some cause, the establishment of the Boston markets excited not a little indignation. On the 17th of May, the following vote was passed by the people of Watertown : “Whereas the inhabitants of the town of Boston, in the county of Suffolk, have of late set up a market in the said town, which by many is thought will prove prejudicial to people in the country : voted, that whatsoever person, or persons, belonging to Watertown, shall within the space of twelve months from the 11th day of June next presume to carry any wares or provisions from out of Watertown, and expose them to sale in the markets that are voted by the inhabitants of the town of Boston to be set up there, shall be subject to pay a fine of twenty shillings for each offence ; one fourth part thereof to the informer, and the remainder to be for the use of the poor of the town of Watertown, to be recovered by the Selectmen of said town before any of his Majesty’s justices of the peace for the county of Middlesex.” This vote was to be presented to the General Sessions of the peace for the county of Middlesex for their confirmation. The formal and strong manner, in which it is expressed, intimates the determined feelings of men resisting what they suppose to be an injurious oppression. It is not easy to perceive in what consisted the mighty grievance, which led to this interdict of traffic. Probably, the people from the country, having been before accustomed to sell their commodities wherever they pleased in the metropolis,

* See Snow’s History of Boston, p. 225.

regarded this restriction to certain places of sale as an infringement upon their rights, and resented it accordingly. This agreement, on the part of the inhabitants of Watertown, to suspend all intercourse of sale with the people of Boston at their markets, must have soon proved as ineffectual, as it was foolish; for, in defiance of votes, people would not long refrain from selling wherever and whatever they found it for their interest to sell. It is to be presumed, that the prohibition shortly became a dead letter. Such a union among all the neighbouring towns, as would amount to a coercion upon the inhabitants of Boston, could hardly have been expected. The whole affair is an instance of that unwise jealousy, with which the country is apt to regard the city.*

A successful effort was at length made by the Western parish in Watertown to become a distinct town. At a meeting of the people of that precinct on the 8th of December, 1737, a committee was appointed to petition the General Court for an act of incorporation, chiefly on account of the difficulties and inconveniences arising from the necessity of transacting the

* That some opposition or resentment was anticipated from the country people, on this occasion, may be inferred from the pains taken to obviate any unfavorable impressions, in the following notice of the opening of the markets, in the News-Letter (a paper published at that time in Boston) of June 6th, 1734: "It's tho't the said markets, carried on conformable to the restrictions, limitations, and regulations of the said order, will by experience be found very beneficial, as to this great Town in general, and to our Country Friends in particular, in many respects, but more especially in having certain fixed places of resort both for selling and buying the necessaries of life from day to day: And the cheaper and better the commodities brought for sale are, certainly the more vendable they will be; which no doubt will induce our Country Neighbours to endeavour to bring as good to the market as they can: *their* interest, as well as *the town's*, has been jointly consulted and aimed at herein." It may be added, that the abovementioned experiment in Boston was unsuccessful at that time, and seems indeed to have been nearly or quite as unpopular there, as in the country. In the course of three years, "the South End market was converted into shops, the North was taken down to be used in constructing a work-house, and the one at the Town-dock was demolished by a mob." Snow's History of Boston, p. 226.

business of the two parishes together. The petition was granted, and the western precinct was incorporated as a town, by the name of Waltham, on the 4th of January (corresponding in new style to the 15th), 1738.*

Our narrative has now brought us to the period when the original territory of Watertown was divided into three towns. Notices of transactions resulting from their former connexion, or from the conditions on which they separated, frequently occur. That portion of the whole, which remains under the old name of Watertown, is of much smaller extent than Weston or Waltham.

In 1733 mention is made, for the first time, I believe, of an altercation resulting from conflicting claims about the fishery. In that year, two complaints, one from people in Newton, Needham, Weston, Medfield, and Sherburne, the other from the Indians in Natick, were presented to the General Court against the inhabitants of Watertown, for stopping the course of the fish in Charles River. The representative of the town was directed to defend their cause in opposition to these complaints. Instances of a similar difficulty, from the interfering claims of neighbouring towns in this business, have since been not infrequent.

About this time a proposal was under discussion among some of the towns in this vicinity, to combine for the purpose of making a joint provision for their poor. They appointed a committee to confer on the subject of building a work-house at the common charge and for the common benefit of the towns concerned. The report of this committee in favor of the project, when read at a public meeting in Watertown, was accepted, and a vote was passed to unite with Cambridge, Waltham, Newton, Weston, and Lexington in building such a work-house. The repre-

* For an accurate and interesting description of Waltham, see Hist. Coll. 2d Series, Vol. III. p. 261.

sentatives of the towns concerned were instructed to apply for an Act of the Court, which should enable them to accomplish this object effectually and advantageously. Whether this plan was ever executed, I am unable to tell. Probably it was not; for, eleven years after this time, the people of Watertown appointed persons "to enquire of the neighbouring towns, and see who of them will come into the affair or scheme of the building of a work-house," an inquiry which implies, that the previous proposal had failed of success. And at a still later period, (March, 1760,) a vote was passed "to join with Cambridge, Newton, and Waltham in raising a sum of money, by lottery or otherwise, for building a work-house." But the project does not appear to have been accomplished. It has been thought by some reflecting men, that large establishments of this kind, in which several towns, perhaps a whole county, should have a common interest, would possess many advantages over the usual mode of supporting the poor.

The practice of arranging places for the people at public worship, by the authority of the town, still continued. May 15th, 1741, persons were chosen "to new seat the meeting-house forthwith by such rules as the town agrees on." In performing this duty, they were instructed "to have regard to age, honour, and usefulness, and to real and personal estate, as it stands in the last invoice." This deference to the distinctions of rank and property seems to us, at the present day, not a little singular. But it was then very common; and one instance of it may be observed in the arrangement of the Catalogue of the graduates of Harvard College, till 1773, when the names began to be placed in alphabetical order. The business of seating the people in the meeting-house recurs, in the records, in 1748 and 1749.

At a public meeting in Watertown, June 29th, 1741, it was proposed "to know the mind of the

town, whether they are willing to encourage *the building of a bridge over Charles River from Cambridge to Boston*, and what they will do for that end." The proposal was rejected by a negative vote. From this record it appears, that the plan of a bridge between Boston and Cambridge was under consideration at a much earlier period, than is commonly supposed. The proposal for a bridge from Boston to Charlestown was made as early as 1720; but I am not aware of any account, which states one to have been distinctly projected from Boston to Cambridge at so early a date as the above mentioned notice.*

The people of Watertown regarded the support of their own bridge over Charles River as a burdensome grievance, and complained heavily of the expense. They made several efforts to obtain relief, in some way, from the government of the Province. In May, 1744, the town, in connexion with Weston and Waltham, voted to apply to the General Court for a grant of land, for this purpose. More than thirty years before, they had endeavoured to procure an Act requiring the whole county of Middlesex to support the bridge. These applications were unavailing; but they persevered from time to time in their attempts to get assistance. It has been already remarked, that when the town claimed of the Court the fulfilment of certain grants of land, they obtained the 2000 acres of upland; but they do not appear to have been equally successful with regard to the meadow land. In May, 1752, they renewed their attention to this subject in connexion with the bridge. Their representative was instructed to join with the representatives of Weston and Waltham in searching the Prov-

* We are however informed by Snow in his *History of Boston*, that "there had been considerable effort to have the first bridge carried from West Boston to Cambridge; but the expediency of making the experiment across the narrower part of the river was so apparent, that the town of Boston had expressed an opinion almost unanimous (1238 to 2) in favor of it." p. 318.

ince Records to find the grant of 1500 acres of meadow, and having thus proved their right to such a tract, to ask of the General Court an equivalent for it in some of the unappropriated lands belonging to the Province, which might be applied for the relief of "their great burden relating to said bridge, that they may be the better enabled to bear that burden, which the public in general enjoy and reap so great benefit and advantage by." It does not appear that the town ever obtained the 1500 acres of meadow, or the equivalent for which they petitioned; and probably, the expectation of help from the Provincial Government in maintaining the bridge was abandoned.

It was owing, I suppose, to the state of the currency,* that in March, 1749, the town voted to defer the usual grant for the Rev. Mr. Storer's salary, and appointed a committee to inquire, meanwhile, "into the contract made with Mr. Storer at the time of his settlement, and to make diligent enquiry what silver was per ounce then, and what the necessities of life then cost, and how things are at this present time." This committee reported at the next May meeting; and sixty pounds were then granted by vote as Mr. Storer's salary for the year from the first of March, larger sums having been previously proposed, and rejected. This appropriation was deemed insufficient by a considerable part of the town; and their opinion prevailed so far, that when the Selectmen soon after called another meeting on the subject, the salary was raised to what seems to have been its regular amount at that time, £66. 13s. 4d.

In 1753 the First Parish in Cambridge presented a petition to the General Court, "that some of the Easterly inhabitants of Watertown with their estates might be annexed to said parish." The people of Watertown appointed a committee to oppose this petition. It was nevertheless granted; and the next

* See Hutchinson, Vol. II. p. 392, &c.

year, the inhabitants of Watertown petitioned for a part of Cambridge and a part of Newton, as an equivalent for what had been taken from them to be annexed to Cambridge. No grant corresponding to this petition appears to have been made. Watertown was thus finally reduced, from its originally large territory, to the small extent included within its present boundaries.* In 1754, it was proposed to make an exchange with Waltham in such a manner, that the inhabitants of some of the extreme parts of each town might be better accommodated in attending public worship; but the proposal was rejected. A committee was chosen to petition "that a number of the inhabitants of Newton might be set off to Watertown." This petition probably related to what was called *Angier's Corner*, which still remains a part of Newton.†

At this period a warm and acrimonious dispute began in the town, and lasted for a considerable time. December 17th, 1753, a proposition was submitted to remove the meeting-house from the hill, on which it stood, to some other place not specified. At that time the proposition was rejected. But the rejection seems only to have given new excitement to the friends of the measure; for, on the 20th of the next February, a meeting was called, chiefly with reference to this subject, and it was then voted that the meeting-house should be removed from School-house

* Watertown still owns a part of a wharf on Charles River in the western quarter of Cambridge.

† It may be worth while to insert here the following curious record, as a specimen of the superintendence exercised by the Selectmen at that time with regard to schools: "At a meeting of the Selectmen at Mr. Jonathan Bemis's on the 4th of Dec. 1752, Mr. Sam'l Coolidge was present, and the Selectmen gave him a thorough talk relating to his past conduct, and what he might expect if he did not behave well in the school for the future: they declar'd unto him that they put him into the school again for tryal, and if he behaved well he should not be wrong'd, and that he was to begin the school the 11th day of this December. Mr. Coolidge complained that he wanted a winter coat: desired Mr. Bemis to get him a bear-skin coat, and get Mr. Meed to make it: and to give the Selectmen an account thereof."

Hill "to the half acre of land lately given by Nath'l Harris Esq. to the town, and that the said house be erected there anew," &c. There was evidently a trial of strength on the question, and the vote passed only "by three odds." The removal was agreed to, it seems, only on the condition, that the town, as such, should be at no expense about it. Accordingly seven men undertook it on their own responsibility, and gave a security that the town should be free from all charge. These men were appointed a committee to see the business executed, and were directed to proceed as speedily as might be. The old house was accordingly taken down, and the materials transported to the destined spot, to be again set up; but before the work could be completed, the building in its unfinished state was burnt to the ground. This took place in May, 1754. No doubt was entertained that the fire was the work of an incendiary: several persons were examined and brought to trial, but evidence could not be found sufficient to convict any one.

The people were thrown into a sort of consternation by this event. The religious services of the Sabbath were at first attended at the Rev. Mr. Storer's house; but another more convenient place was soon provided to answer the present purpose. They next proceeded, "under the present awful frown of Heaven" (as they called the sad effects of their own contention), to appoint a day of fasting and prayer, and to apply to Mr. Storer for advice and direction on the subject. The day was observed, and several of the neighbouring ministers were invited to attend and assist in the services.

A town meeting was held June 13th, 1754, at which it was determined by vote to build a new house for public worship, fifty-six feet long, and forty-two feet wide, on the same place as before, viz., the half acre of land given by Nathaniel Harris, Esq. Six hundred pounds were at first appropriated for this object,

and a building committee chosen, with directions to have the house finished as soon as possible. A protest against all these proceedings, by those who had from the outset been opposed to the removal of the meeting-house from the hill, was presented and placed on record. The asperity of the language used in this protest sufficiently indicates the irritated state of feeling between the two parties. They, who signed it, complained that their wishes had been slighted, and their rights violated, in the whole business; a grievance, which they thought the more intolerable, as they claimed to be "the owners and possessors of much the greater part of the rateable estate in the town." They protested against paying any part of the cost of the new house, among other reasons, because they conceived that the persons, who had at first given a formal pledge to save the town from all expense on account of the removal and rebuilding of the meeting-house, were still bound by that engagement, since, when they took upon themselves that obligation, they voluntarily incurred the risk of all accidents and hazards; and consequently that the town ought not to be burdened with any charge whatever. Notwithstanding this argument, the town did not require the committee, formerly appointed, to fulfil their bond, probably because the fire, in which the meeting-house had been destroyed, was believed to have taken place under such circumstances, as would not allow it to be fairly considered as one of the hazards incurred by the engagement. The bond was soon after relinquished into the hands of the committee.

The building of the new meeting-house proceeded, without any regard to the protest. It appears to have been completed as early as February, 1755. Till very recently, it was the only one in the town, and with an addition hereafter to be mentioned, it is the place of worship still used by the Congregational Society. This house is consequently somewhat more than

seventy-five years old.* It may easily be supposed, that the former situation of the meeting-house, on the summit of a high hill, must have been exceedingly inconvenient, especially in the winter; nor can we wonder that a majority of the people were in favor of the removal. It is to be regretted, however, that this could not have been done in the spirit of peace and of mutual concession. The effects of the unhappy dispute, in one form or another, are said to have lasted several years.

The meeting-house being finished, the pews were soon disposed of, being assigned, by the town, to individuals, according to their proportion in the schedule of taxes. It was voted, that "they should be settled upon real and personal estate," the valuation used for this purpose being the same by which the rate for building the house had been made. The object of this vote was, I suppose, to regulate the order of precedence in choice. When any one should wish to sell his pew, the town was to have the refusal of it; and when any person should remove from Watertown, his pew was to revert to the town, upon their reimbursing the money which he had paid for it. Other regulations concerning the mode of obtaining and transferring the pews were established, though evidently with much opposition.

Arrangements were made for selling "the ministerial place,† exclusive of the marsh," if Mr. Storer's

* The account of cost of this meeting-house, as reported by the committee, stands as follows:

To the contract with Messrs Pierpoint and Evans .	£4840	<i>Old Tenor.</i>
To services done by persons, and materials procured,	360	: 1
To allowance for finishing the meeting-house . . .	51	: 0
Granted by the town . . .	£4500	<i>Old Tenor.</i>
Materials of former house sold .	151	: 1
	<u> </u>	5251 : 1
		4651 : 1
	£4651	: 1
		<u> </u>
		£600 : 0

The sum of six hundred pounds, *old tenor*, was raised on the pews to cancel the remainder due in the account.

† The parsonage here mentioned was, I am told, the place recently occupied by Mr. David Livermore, and now in the possession of his family.

consent could be obtained. He consented, and the place was sold. The committee, to whom the business was entrusted, were instructed to offer Mr. Storer the interest of the money arising from the sale, or to procure another place, as he should choose. It seems he preferred the latter proposal; and the town purchased the parsonage which was occupied by him and his successors.*

At this time, Watertown owned a share in a tract of land near Wachusett Hill, as we learn from a vote, passed May 12th, 1755, to sell "their right in the farm near Wachusett Hill." Mr. John Hunt, Lieutenant Daniel Whitney, and Ensign Jonathan Bemis were appointed a committee to effect the sale. It is not said in the records how the town came into possession of this land; but it was doubtless their part of the 2000 acres before mentioned, which they had claimed and received in consequence of an old grant made by the General Court. Waltham and Weston had each a right in that grant, because it was made before they were incorporated; and accordingly these towns are mentioned as having claims in the tract near Wachusett. When Watertown's part in this land was sold, the sum of £66. 13s. 4d., from the proceeds of the sale, was (by vote, October 6th, 1755,) appropriated towards the purchase of the new parsonage, although the committee, who were to buy that estate for the town, had been expressly instructed to give no more for it than would accrue from the sale of the old parsonage. It does not appear on record, nor have I been able to learn, what disposition was made of the rest of the money, for which Watertown's right in the land near Wachusett was sold.

Much dissatisfaction (on what ground, we are not

* The buildings, and a small part of the land, belonging to this ministerial place, were sold in 1823. There is now no parsonage in the town.

informed) was expressed concerning the choice of a moderator at a town meeting on the 5th of March, 1759. In consequence of that uneasiness, and with the consent of all parties, application was made to the General Court, requesting them to set aside the proceedings of that meeting, and to appoint a moderator to act for the town. The Court complied with the request, and appointed for moderator the Hon. Benjamin Lincoln, Esq., father of that distinguished officer and patriot, General Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln came to Watertown, and presided at the town meeting. Here is another curious instance of an appeal to the Provincial government on town matters. We do not learn what the difficulty was, which produced the necessity of resorting to this expedient. At the meeting of which Lincoln was moderator, nothing but the ordinary business of the town was transacted.

A notice occurs, March 15th, 1762, that the Second Precinct in Cambridge had petitioned to have a part of Watertown annexed to them. The people of Watertown opposed this petition; and it appears to have been rejected.

In 1767 an application was made to the General Court "to have the fishery in Watertown put under some regulations, to prevent the many quarrels and disputes that arise thereby." Legislative enactments respecting this subject have been frequent in more recent times.

The dark and stormy period of the Revolution was now fast approaching. The excitement, by which it was preceded, doubtless reached every village in the land. The indignation called forth by the act imposing certain duties on tea, paper, glass, and other articles imported into the colonies, is familiarly known. When, towards the close of the year 1767, a meeting was held in Boston for the purpose of promoting the use of home manufactures, and preventing, as far as possible, the importation of Europe-

an articles, sympathy and support in the measure were sought by an appeal to the other towns. At a public meeting in Watertown, January 11th, 1768, a letter was read to the inhabitants from the Selectmen of Boston, inclosing a copy of the votes, which had been passed there in relation to the abovementioned purpose. After some debate, the people of Watertown appointed a committee to report on the subject, and at an adjourned meeting on the 18th of January, they passed the following vote, the phraseology of which is somewhat amusing, as well as spirited. "The town of Watertown, being alarmed at the late impositions on the colonies, and perceiving the streights and difficulties the people of this Province must be brought into by lessening the medium of trade, have considered with pleasure the attempts made for laying aside the use of foreign articles we may well do without, and the resolutions many towns have come into for the promotion of industry and the encouragement of their own manufactures; we do also cheerfully and unanimously vote, that we are ready to join in any patriotick endeavours to lessen our importations, and thereby prevent our gold and silver from giving us the slip, that we consent to lay aside the use not only of the articles enumerated by the town of Boston in their resolves, but of all foreign teas as expensive and pernicious, as well as unnecessary, this continent abounding with many herbs of a more salubrious quality, which, if we were as much used to as the poisonous Bohea, would no doubt in time be as agreeable, perhaps much more so; and whilst by a manly influence we expect our women to make this sacrifice to the good of their country, we hereby declare we shall highly honour and esteem the encouragers of our own manufactures and the general use of the productions of this continent; this being in our judgment at this time a necessary means, under God, of rendering us a happy and free people." It may

excite a smile at the present day to observe the strong terms, in which our fathers thought it necessary, in their zeal for resisting what they considered aggression, to denounce that refreshing beverage, the praises of which Dr. Johnson has celebrated by describing himself as one "who with tea amuses the evening, with tea solaces the midnight, and with tēa welcomes the morning." They seem to have been apprehensive that their measures of hostility against tea would be least likely to find a cordial acquiescence on the part of the ladies; and if tradition do not misinform us on this point, their apprehensions were not without foundation. At the same meeting they gave instructions to their representative, which, while they manifest a warm determination to resist encroachments on their rights, indicate, by the respectful mention made of the king and the mother country, how far they were at that time from any thought of renouncing their allegiance to Great Britain. After charging him to conduct himself agreeably to the directions given by the town of Boston, "who to their immortal honour took the lead," they proceed as follows: "we desire you would be upon your guard against any who, under false pretences of patriotick zeal to their country, may endeavour to draw you into any rash or disorderly measures, either disrespectful to the best of Sovereigns or undutiful to our Mother Country; but that you coolly and dispassionately join, and repeatedly join if expedient, in all firm, vigorous, but most legal and peaceable measures in ascertaining our charter privileges, and for obtaining relief of those grievances which otherwise threaten us with impending ruin."

September 21st, 1768, Mr. John Remington was chosen by the town to attend the Convention, summoned at Boston to take into consideration the state of public affairs, when a military force from England was daily expected to be stationed in the metropolis.*

* See Gordon, History, &c. Vol. I. p. 164.

Votes and resolves for the purpose of discouraging importations from England were again passed, March 8th, 1770, by Watertown, and a copy of them transmitted to "the committee of merchants in Boston."

In November, 1772, a committee of correspondence was appointed, at a town meeting in Boston,* to write circular letters to the several towns in the province, enumerating the wrongs and grievances inflicted by the British Parliament, and calling upon the people to be active and watchful. The inhabitants of Watertown, like those of most other places in the colony, replied to this appeal in a tone of earnest and cordial sympathy. A committee was chosen, and on the 5th of February, 1773, an answer to the circular was reported, which was accepted, and put on record. This answer states, in very strong and solemn expressions, the conviction entertained of their dangers and duties at the momentous crisis; but it contains nothing sufficiently peculiar to be extracted.

The agitating excitement, which led to the destruction of the tea in Boston harbour, was of course felt with peculiar intensity in the immediate neighbourhood of the metropolis. The people of Watertown met, January 3d, 1774, and expressed their sentiments and purposes in relation to the whole subject, in the resolves common at that period, preceded by a spirited preamble. Adverting to the meeting which had been held in Boston,† they say, "We are fully of opinion the people had a right thus to meet and consult for their common safety. We read that the Jews in a state of captivity and slavery, under an arbitrary king, when a decree was gone forth to destroy them, had liberty to assemble together and defend themselves, and consult how to ward off the blow that was coming upon them, by preventing the wicked edict being carried into execution; under Providence they were

* Gordon, Vol. I. p. 208.

† Gordon, Vol. I. p. 223.

wonderfully succeeded, having the kind influences of a good Mordecai in their favour, who, not accusing them of riot, sought their welfare, and was accepted of the multitude of his brethren. And we are also fully of opinion, that the people assembled at Boston on the 14th and 16th of December last had no design or desire, that the tea on board the vessels in the harbour should be destroyed, or any way damaged; but on the contrary were very desirous, and used their utmost endeavours, that said tea might be safely returned to the owners thereof. But that the destruction of the tea was occasioned by the Custom House officer's and the Governor's refusing to grant a clearance and pass for the vessel, that was designed to carry said tea back to the owner from whence it came." The resolves following this preamble, proscribed, with all possible strength of expression, the use of tea in any mode or quantity.

August 22d, 1774, the Selectmen were requested by the town "to meet such persons as may appear at a proposed meeting, to be held at Concord on the 30th day of this present month, from the several towns in this county, to consult what may be proper to do in order to preserve the charter rights." In the next month of the same year, the town ordered that their militia should be exercised two hours every week, for the three autumn months, and that a view should be taken of the arms and ammunition in the town, to be reported at a subsequent meeting.

Inconformity with the resolutions and advice of the county of Suffolk,* the people of Watertown voted (October 3d, 1774,) that their collectors of taxes should pay no more money into the treasury of the Province till further orders, but that the money should all be paid into the town treasury. A pledge was given to the collectors, that they should be protected

* Gordon, Vol. I. p. 255.

and supported in carrying this vote into execution. At the same meeting, their representative was directed to unite with the representatives of the several towns, in forming a Provincial Congress.

November 21st, 1774, a committee consisting of nine persons was appointed to carry into effect the association and the resolutions entered into by the General Congress at Philadelphia in the preceding October, and likewise the resolutions of the Provincial Congress.

On the 27th of November, 1774, the Rev. Seth Storer died, in the 73d year of his age, and in the 51st year of his ministry. He was born at Saco, Maine, May 27th, 1702, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1720, at the early age of eighteen. His father was Colonel Joseph Storer of Wells in Maine, who was much distinguished in the Indian wars at that time.* The ministry of Mr. Storer, was the longest, which occurs in the history of Watertown. I am not able, after a diligent inquiry, to record any particulars of his life or ministry. The general impression which I have received of his character, is

* He is mentioned by Belknap, who tells us (Hist. of N. H. Vol. I. p. 211), that on the 9th of June, 1691, the Indians "attacked *Storer's* garrison at Wells, but were bravely repulsed"; and by Mather, (Magnal. Book vii. Chap. 6th, Appendix,) who likewise speaks of "*Storer's* garrison at Wells." His brother, Samuel Storer, was also distinguished for his bravery and good conduct in the same war. Their father was William Storer, one of the earliest settlers on the Eastern shores. It is not clearly ascertained whether the family came from England or Scotland. The name is said to have been formerly written sometimes *Storer* and sometimes *Story*, even in the same instrument, when the same individual was intended. An instance of this variety is found in the name of Augustine Story in the famous deed from four Sagamores to John Wheelwright and others, which is given in the Appendix to Belknap's New Hampshire, Vol. I., and the authenticity of which has been so fully discussed and denied by Mr. Savage in the Appendix to Winthrop, Vol. I. Benjamin Storer, who is said by Hubbard (p. 631) to have been killed by the Indians at Wells, in April, 1677, was doubtless one of this family. The Rev. Seth Storer had a sister named Mary, who was carried away by the Indians from Wells, or Saco, to Canada; she was brought up near Montreal, was married to a Frenchman, Jean St. Germaine, and died August 25th, 1747. Ebenezer Storer, Esq., treasurer of Harvard College from 1777 to 1807, was a nephew of the clergyman.

honorable to him as a man, and as a Christian. He discharged the duties of his office, for half a century, in a quiet, unobtrusive manner, but with scrupulous diligence and fidelity. Moderate in his wishes and fond of retirement, he never coveted applause or sought to attract notice. He found his happiness in the conscientious performance of his regular, tranquil duties ; and he seems to me to have possessed much of the spirit manifested by Hooker, when, with beautiful simplicity of expression, he solicited his Archbishop for "some quiet country parsonage, where," he said, "I may see God's blessings spring out of my mother earth, and eat my own bread in peace and privacy." The few, who remember Mr. Storer, testify that his people regarded him with affectionate respect ; and they recollect that in his old age he was beloved by young people and by children, which is one of the best evidences, that could be had, of the goodness of his heart and the excellence of his character. His intellectual powers were respectable, and well employed. As a theologian, he was candid and mild in his sentiments, and loved "the doctrine which is according to godliness," much better, than "questions and strifes of words." As a preacher, he was judicious, practical, and edifying, his chief end being to produce that religious improvement which is founded upon permanent principles. I do not find that he ever published even a single sermon, or any other production of his pen. In the warm controversy, which arose in the town concerning the removal of the meeting-house, during his ministry, an occasion of offence to one or the other of the parties was scarcely to be avoided ; and however prudently and firmly he may have conducted himself, he is said, for a time, to have fallen under the displeasure of a part of the town, in consequence of that transaction. It may easily be conceived, that this was owing rather to the spirit with which the dispute was carried on, than to any blameworthy feelings or

behaviour on his part. It was in the course of his ministry, that New England was agitated by what was called the great Revival of religion, a period of strong excitement, when many a clergyman was ready to say, in the exulting language used by Whitefield, that he had every day "a constant *levee of wounded souls*, and many quite slain by the Law." In this commotion Mr. Storer and his parish seem to have had no share. His name does not appear among those of the pastors, who gave their testimony at the meeting in Boston, July 7th, 1743, nor among those who, having been absent from that meeting, afterward communicated their attestations in letters. He had too much sobriety and calmness to be carried along by the force of sympathy or spiritual rivalry, in an excitement, the result of which, he might foresee, would at least be of a doubtful character.

Mr. Storer has left on record 1419 baptisms, and the names of 328 persons received into the church, during his ministry.*

We come now to the period, in which Watertown became more intimately connected with the public proceedings of a fearful crisis. The second Provincial Congress assembled at Cambridge on the 1st of February, 1775.† Their session was continued till the 16th of that month, when they adjourned to meet at Concord on the 22d of March. At that time and place, accordingly they were reassembled; and after transacting the important business before them, they again adjourned to the 10th of May. In specifying the time, however, they made a provision, that, if circumstances should require it, they might be called together sooner, and that, if this should be necessary, notice should be given by the members in Cambridge and

* For the particulars, which I have stated concerning his family, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. J. P. B. Storer of Walpole, Mass., one of the descendants of a brother of this Watertown minister.

† Jonathan Brown represented Watertown in this Congress.

the vicinity. In consequence of the expedition of the British troops from Boston on the 19th of April, and its bloody result, a meeting was suddenly summoned at Concord on the 22d ; and having appointed a chairman and clerk, they immediately adjourned to Watertown. Here the Congress assembled, during the remainder of the session, in the meeting-house. Joseph Warren, Esq., the early and lamented martyr in the cause of freedom on the memorable 17th of June, presided at their deliberations after the Hon. John Hancock had been chosen delegate to the Continental Congress at Philadelphia. A committee of nine persons was chosen to collect the most exact evidence concerning the facts in the affair of the 19th, at Lexington ; and another committee to draw up an account of all the transactions of that day.

The third and last Provincial Congress, consisting for the most part of the same members who composed the second, was chosen, and met at Watertown on the 31st of May. They held their sessions, as before, in the meeting-house. The Rev. Dr. Langdon, president of the College, preached a sermon before them, appropriate to the occasion, from Isaiah i. 26. Joseph Warren, Esq.* was chosen President, and Samuel Freeman, Jr., Secretary. This session lasted till the 19th of July. The Congress were busy in adopting such measures, as the distracted state of the Colony required. The suffering poor of Boston were particularly objects of attention ; and every thing was done that could be done, to provide for their removal and support. Means were likewise adopted to procure arms, and to save provisions and supplies from falling into the hands of the British.

* Warren went from Watertown, with all the alacrity of patriotic feeling, on the morning of the 17th of June. Just before his departure, I am informed, he entreated the ladies of the house, in which he boarded, to prepare and procure as great a quantity of lint and bandages as possible, observing, "The poor fellows will want them all before night." He was succeeded, as President of the Congress, by the Hon. James Warren of Plymouth.

This Provincial Congress was succeeded by a General Court, or General Assembly of the Colony (as it was sometimes styled), chosen in conformity with the colony charter. They convened at the meeting-house in Watertown on the 26th of July.* The Hon. James Warren was chosen Speaker, and Samuel Freeman, Clerk. The General Assembly continued their sessions at Watertown till the 9th of November, 1776, when they adjourned to meet at the State House in Boston on the 12th of the same month. Their measures were such as the state of the times required. In the first session, acts were passed confirming the doings of "the several Provincial Congresses," making and emitting bills of public credit, declaring the rights of certain towns in Massachusetts Bay to elect representatives, removing officers, civil and military, who held their places by the appointment of any Governor or Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts Bay, &c. At a subsequent session, measures were adopted to encourage the manufacture of powder and fire-arms, to fit out armed vessels to defend the seacoast, to provide for a more equal representation in the General Court, to raise troops from time to time, and such other proceedings as are familiarly known in the history of that period.

Among the few newspapers printed at that time, was "The Boston Gazette and Country Journal." It had been published for some time in Boston by Edes & Gill,† and was distinguished by the spirited and fearless tone, in which it defended the American cause. The paper obtained, as we may readily suppose, great popularity and a wide circulation. Such a publication, of course, could not be continued in

* The Council met in the house of the late Mr. Edmund Fowle, now occupied by his widow. This house was selected for the purpose on account of its vicinity to the meeting-house, which enabled the two bodies to have easy and immediate intercourse.

† For an account of these printers, see Thomas's *History of Printing in America*. Vol. I. p. 341.

Boston, while the town was in the possession and power of the British. Notwithstanding the avenues between the metropolis and the country were as much as possible closed, Edes found means to escape by night in a boat. Gill, who had less zeal or courage than his partner, remained in Boston, and lived in seclusion till the danger was over. When Edes fled from Boston, he took with him a press, and a few types. With these he established himself at Watertown, where he opened his printing-house, continued the publication of the Gazette, and was employed as printer by the Provincial Congress and the General Assembly. Though his facilities for printing were but poor and slender, his zeal and diligence enabled him to surmount all difficulties.* "The Boston Gazette and Country Journal" was published in Watertown from June 5th, 1775, to October 28th, 1776, when, the British having evacuated Boston, the editor returned and again established his paper there.

In this Gazette were published those letters of Hutchinson, which were discovered at his house in Milton, and inflamed into stronger violence the obloquy

*"The printing he executed at Watertown did not, indeed, do much credit to the art; but the work, at this time, done at other presses, was not greatly superior. The war broke out suddenly, and few of any profession were prepared for the event. All kinds of printing materials had been usually imported from England; even ink for printers had not, in any great quantity, been made in America. This resource was, by the war, cut off; and a great scarcity of these articles soon ensued. At that time, there were but three small paper-mills in Massachusetts; in New Hampshire, there were none; and Rhode-Island contained only one, which was out of repair. The paper which these mills could make, fell far short of the necessary supply. Paper, of course, was extremely scarce; and what could be procured was badly manufactured, not having more than half the requisite labor bestowed upon it. It was often taken from the mill wet and unsized. People had not been in the habit of saving rags, and stock for the manufacture of paper was obtained with great difficulty. Every thing like rags was ground up together to make a substitute for paper. This, with wretched ink and worn-out types, produced miserable printing," Thomas's *History of Printing*. Vol. I. p. 343. The appearance of Edes's paper, at the time referred to, corresponds to what might be expected from this description.

which the Governor had before incurred.* The publication of these letters began in the first number of the paper which was printed at Watertown, and continued nearly a year. They were occasionally accompanied with comments, intended to expose the duplicity of Hutchinson, and to keep the public indignation warm. Political essays of the most spirited character, exhortations and addresses to the people, were continually appearing in the Gazette, some of them marked with talent and fairness, and some with that heedless violence which is always the growth of strong political excitement.† It is remarkable that no particular account is given in this paper of the affair at Lexington and Concord on the 19th of April, nor of the battle of Bunker Hill. Brief allusions are sometimes made to these events; and in July a short statement occurs of the killed and wounded on both sides at Charlestown on the 17th of June, but without comment. It seems difficult to account for the omission of all details con-

* Gordon, Vol. I. p. 344.

† The following "Extract of a letter from a gentleman in America to his friend in London," copied from the Gazette for November 6th, 1775. is an illustration of the pleasantry, with which the resolute spirit of the times occasionally displayed itself: the person alluded to in the letter, I suppose to have been the celebrated Dr. Price:

"Tell our dear friend, Dr. P——, who sometimes has his doubts about our firmness, that America is determined and unanimous, a very few Tories excepted, who will probably soon export themselves. Britain, at the expence of three millions, has killed 150 Yankees this campaign, which is £20,000 a head; and at Bunker's Hill she gained a mile of ground, half of which she has since lost again by not taking post on Plough'd Hill. During the same time, 60,000 children have been born in America. From these data, his excellent mathematical head will easily calculate the time and expense requisite to kill us all, and conquer our whole territory."

In the paper of April 1st, 1776, is the following *jeu d'esprit* in reference to the evacuation of Boston: "We hear that last Lord's day se'nnight, the Rev. Mr. Bridge of Chelmsford preached a most animating discourse from these words in the 2d of Kings, vii. 7. 'Wherefore they arose, and fled in the twilight, and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life.' This passage of Scripture is a good description of the late flight of our ministerial enemies; for they left their tents, and their horses, and a number of Tories for asses."

cerning matters of such deep and agitating interest, as these must have possessed.

The inhabitants of Boston, when they were driven from home, and dispersed in the country, had several town meetings in Watertown, which were summoned by means of notifications in the Gazette. At one of these, September 5th, 1775, Mr. William Cooper was chosen representative of Boston in place of the Hon. Samuel Adams, who had been elected to a seat in the Council. Another meeting was held November 28th, 1775, to choose a representative for Boston in the room of the notorious Dr. Church, who had been expelled from the House, for attempting to carry on a secret and criminal correspondence with the enemy. Committees, appointed to manage affairs for the people of Boston, frequently met and transacted their business at Watertown. In 1776 the anniversary of the fifth of March was observed, in the usual form, by the people of Boston at the meeting-house in Watertown. The Hon. Benjamin Austin was moderator of the meeting on this occasion; the Rev. Dr. Cooper offered the prayers; and the Rev. Peter Thacher of Malden delivered an oration on the dangerous tendency of standing armies in time of peace, which is said to have been received with warm and universal approbation.*

The inhabitants of Watertown bore their part of the losses and burdens of the country, at this perilous period. One of their number was killed on the 19th of April †; and many others, during the war, either died by sickness in camp, or fell on the field of battle.

* This oration was printed at Watertown by Edes, and the following fable from Phædrus was affixed to it for a motto :

Asellum in prato timidus pascebat senex :
 Is, hostium clamore subito territus,
 Suadebat Asino fugere, ne possent capi.
 At ille lentus : " Quæso, num binas mihi
 Clitellas impositurum victorem putas ? "
 Senex négavit. " Ergo, quid refert mea,
 Cui serviam, clitellas dum portem meas ? " LIB. I. 15.

† This was Mr. Joseph Coolidge.

Early in 1775 they granted money "to encourage the learning of the military art," bound themselves by covenants to promote in certain specified modes the interests of liberty, collected and secured arms* and ammunition, and in general entered heartily into the measures for defence and protection, which were common at that time. They raised their proportion of soldiers, and granted them the usual bounty in addition to the pay they received from the public chest.†

In the first stage of the great contest, the object of the Americans unquestionably was not independence, but the restoration, on just principles, of the ancient and peaceful union between the colonies and the mother country. But the natural consequence of open hostilities was to carry the feelings of people rapidly beyond this point; for the absurdity of continuing to profess allegiance to a government, against which they were in arms, must have pressed itself on their notice. Indications, not to be mistaken, of a strong wish for bold and decisive measures to sever the tie of allegiance, which had now lost all its charm, were manifested early in 1776. When the Continental Congress sounded the feelings of their fellow citizens on this subject, through the medium of the Provincial Assemblies, they found themselves anticipated, or at least promptly supported, by the people in the disposition to take the final step. One of the many instances of this state of feeling we find in the following vote at a town meeting in Water-

* A committee was appointed "to mount the *great guns*," &c. This expression refers, I presume, to certain cannons, for which some British officers came to Watertown to search; but they searched in vain, the pieces being effectually concealed in a barn. At the beginning of the war, there was a depository of arms and military stores, under guard, at the house of Mr. Edward Richardson, who kept an inn at the Eastern part of the town, where one is kept now.

† In March, 1777, the sum which had been granted by the town, in this way, to officers and soldiers, amounted to £604. At a later date, May, 1778, the town "voted a further sum of £5 to each of the men that went to the White Plains in the year 1776; and that the men that went to the Northward in the year 1776 with Capt. Edward Harrington be allowed a further sum of £1. 13s. 4d. each."

town on the 20th of May, 1776 : “ A resolve of the late House of Representatives, relating to the Congress of the Thirteen United Colonies, declaring them independent of Great Britain, being read, the question was put to know the mind of the town, whether they will stand by, and defend the same with their lives and estates ; and it passed in the affirmative unanimously.” Congress had likewise, in May, 1776, recommended to the several colonies to frame and adopt such governments, as their circumstances might require. These were to be not temporary regulations, such as had been resorted to before, but so far permanent as to be unlimited with respect to time. The subject came before the Massachusetts Legislature in September of the same year, and some preparatory measures were adopted. On the 7th of October, the people of Watertown “ took into consideration a resolve of the General Court of the 17th of September last, relating to a form of government ; and after some debate thereon, they voted unanimously, that they give their consent that the present House of Representatives, with the Council, should form a plan of government for this state, to be laid before the several towns in the same, for their consideration, before it be ratified.*

After the capture of Burgoyne’s army, Watertown was selected as one of the places, at which it was proposed to quarter the officers. This proposal was zealously resisted by the inhabitants. Taking alarm at the prospect of having such inmates in their houses, at a meeting in December, 1777, they declared their opinion “ that the quartering the British officers among the inhabitants of Watertown at this time would be very dangerous to the peace and safety of the town, as well as the publick, and therefore they cannot give their

* The effort at this time made towards obtaining a Constitution for the State was unsuccessful. See Bradford’s Hist. of Mass. from July 1775 to 1789, p. 117 and 158. The Constitution proposed in 1778 was rejected by Watertown, as it was by a great majority of other towns.

consent thereto." Some of the people, however, were inclined to furnish accommodations for the officers in their families. To such the abovementioned vote was intended as a prohibition. It was also communicated to the Deputy Quarter Master by the Selectmen. The objection made by the Watertown people on this occasion amounted probably to nothing more, than the repugnance naturally felt by plain and sober citizens to having military strangers and foreigners in the midst of them. Some of the officers were quartered among them, notwithstanding their remonstrances, and some of them were stationed at Angier's Corner in Newton, and other places in the neighbourhood.

January 17th, 1778, the representative of the town was instructed to use his influence and give his aid towards ratifying and confirming the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union among the United States of America, as agreed upon and proposed by Congress.

It is time to return to the ecclesiastical affairs of the town, which, in the midst of the momentous political transactions of the period, lost the prominence usually belonging to them in a New England village. Immediately after Mr. Storer's death, the town voted, according to the custom of the times, "to set apart a day for fasting and prayer, to seek the Divine presence and direction relating to the settling another Gospel minister." They invited those clergymen, who had borne the pall at Mr. Storer's funeral, to officiate on the occasion.* From that time the services of the pulpit were performed by various preachers, engaged from time to time, as they were wanted. Among these was Mr. Samuel Henshaw, who was paid "the sum of thirty pounds in full for his preaching." Dr. Cooper, pastor of the church in Brattle Square, Boston, resided in the

* These were the Rev. Mr. Cook of Cambridge (now West Cambridge), the Rev. Mr. Cushing of Waltham, the Rev. Mr. Clarke of Lexington, the Rev. Dr. Appleton of Cambridge, the Rev. Mr. Woodward of Weston, and the Rev. Mr. Merriam of Newton.

country on account of the troubles in the metropolis, and preached in Watertown for a considerable time.*

It was not till November, 1777, that any movement was made towards the settlement of a minister. At that time, the town voted unanimously to concur with the church in the choice of Mr. Daniel Adams. He accepted the invitation, and was ordained on the 29th of April, 1778. "In consideration of the extraordinary price of the necessaries of life," he was to have £150 in addition to his salary for the first year. A promise was also given him that such grants should be made, from time to time, as the state of the medium, or other circumstances, might render just and reasonable. At the ordination of Mr. Adams, I have been informed, the sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Prentiss of Medfield, and the charge delivered by the Rev. Dr. Appleton of Cambridge. I have not learned who performed the other services of the occasion.

In 1778 Watertown again became the seat of government for a short time. The small-pox prevailed in Boston to such a degree, as to excite no little alarm; and it was on that account (as appears by the State Records) that the House of Representatives requested the Council to grant them an adjournment. On the 30th of May, 1778, they were accordingly adjourned to meet on the next Tuesday, June 2d, at Watertown. There they assembled, and held the remainder of the session. They resumed their session at Boston in September, 1778.

The settlement of Mr. Adams was regarded by his people as an event of happy promise; but their pleasant hopes were doomed soon to be struck down by the premature death of their pastor. In August following his ordination he fell sick of the dysentery, which was then prevalent, and after a violent and

* February 12th, 1776, the Selectmen "signed an order on the treasurer to pay the Rev. Dr. Samuel Cooper £20 in part for his service in the work of the ministry in Watertown."

painful illness of about six weeks died, on Wednesday, the 16th of September, in the thirty-third year of his age. His ministry, consequently, was of less than half a year's duration. On the Saturday following his death, he was buried in the tomb of Mr. Capen, one of his parishioners, and his funeral sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Cushing of Waltham. He was cut off in the morning of usefulness and of hope, and his valuable labors were remembered with a melancholy and touching interest, for the brevity which God was pleased to assign to them.

The Rev. Daniel Adams was the only son of Elisha Adams, Esq., of Medway, where he was born in January, 1746. He was of the fifth generation from Henry Adams, a Puritan emigrant, who came from Devonshire, England, about the year 1630, and settled in Braintree, now Quincy.* He was prepared for college under the tuition of the Rev. Jonathan Townsend of Medfield, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1774. Being then of mature age, he immediately began the study of theology, which he pursued, partly with the Rev. Mr. Bucknam of his native town, and partly with the Rev. Mr. Brown of Sherburne. He was received, as a preacher, with general and high approbation; and about the time when he was called to Watertown, he also had an invitation to settle at Princeton. Short as was his connexion with his people, he won their confidence and attach-

* To the memory of this man, the late venerable and eminent John Adams, the second President of the United States, who was one of his descendants, erected a monument in Quincy with an inscription. From this inscription the following is an extract. "In memory of HENRY ADAMS, who took his flight from the Dragon persecution, in Devonshire, England, and alighted with eight sons near Mount Wollaston. One of the sons returned to England; and, after taking some time to explore the country, four removed to Medfield and the neighbouring towns; two to Chelmsford. One only, Joseph, who lies here at his left hand, remained here, who was an original proprietor in the township of Braintree, incorporated in 1639." See Farmer's Genealogical Register.

ment in no common degree; and those, who now remember him, bear witness to the great respect, in which his services and character were held. His early death was deeply and sincerely lamented by his parishioners, and the kind attention, with which they had treated him, especially during his sickness, was continued to his family after his decease. His preaching is said to have been of the most edifying and impressive character. When the General Court, as before mentioned, met in Watertown in 1778, Mr. Adams was their chaplain; and his fervor and power in discharging the duties of that station were long remembered, evincing the earnestness with which he entered into the public interests of that anxious and trying period. His power as a singer was very remarkable; and it is related that at his funeral the choir of singers, whom he had been accustomed to lead from the pulpit, were so much affected, that it was with great difficulty they could proceed in the performance of their part at the solemnity. He left a widow, and one son. Another son was born after the father's death. Both his children are now living.* During his short ministry, eight were baptized, and two admitted to the church. I do not find, that any of his writings were published.

The following obituary notice of Mr. Adams, which is believed to do no more than justice to his memory, appeared in Edes's Boston Gazette for September 28th, 1778.

"From Watertown we have the melancholy news of the death of the Rev. Daniel Adams, who, after a most distressing illness of six weeks, resigned his valuable life into the hands of that God who gave it, with the most pious submission, in the 33d year of his age, after having been settled in the ministry only

* One of these is Daniel Adams, Esq., of Medfield, who has obligingly furnished me with most of the abovementioned particulars respecting his father.

five months. He was the only son of Elisha Adams, Esq., of Medway, who for a long time represented that town in the Great and General Court. Those, who knew the deceased, knew his many virtues. His publick and private character were such, as did honour to mankind, to the holy religion he professed, and to the sacred order to which he belonged. From his first appearance, as a preacher, he was almost universally admired. He never puzzled his own nor his hearers' minds with nice metaphysical disquisitions in polemick divinity, but preached and enforced, with peculiar energy, the well known acknowledged precepts of the New Testament, with such meekness and simplicity as became a disciple of the blessed Jesus. His genius for vocal musick was extraordinary; and in that part of divine worship, his harmonious voice was heard from the sacred desk with a degree of rapture. The inexpressible grief of a fond wife, mourning the loss of a most agreeable partner; the parental distress of elderly worthy parents, bemoaning the fate of their most engaging only son; the undissembled sorrows of a whole town, lamenting the bereavement of their much respected pastor, demand a sympathetick tribute of sorrow from every humane and feeling heart. He has left a little son, too young to feel his irreparable loss.

To him 'tis given to die: to us 'tis given
To live! Alas, one moment sets us even.
Mark! how impartial is the will of Heaven."

In November 1778, the town ordered an investigation to be made into the doings of the committee, who were chosen in 1755 to sell the old parsonage and the farm in Princeton, near Wachusett. The persons appointed to inquire into the affair made a report to the town in March, 1779, which was ordered to lie on file. This report I have not been able to find, and consequently cannot state the result. Whatever might have been the circumstances, which led to the inves-

tigation, no further discussion of the subject seems to have taken place. At the last mentioned meeting, a committee was likewise chosen, to join with some of the inhabitants of Newton in a petition to the General Court to annex them to Watertown.

In conformity with a resolve of the General Court relating to a new Constitution of government for the State, the town on the 24th of May, 1779, took the subject into consideration, and voted by a large majority against having a new form of government at that time.* At the same meeting, the fishery was brought under discussion, and the town seem to have been in doubt what might be the nature and extent of their rights respecting it. Persons were appointed to inquire whether the town had power to let out the fishery ; if they had, it was to be leased for one year ; if not, the committee were to petition the General Court to grant the power in question, for the benefit of the town. From this notice, we may presume, that the fishery had not been let out before. It probably began to be leased annually about the time when the inquiry, which has just been mentioned, was instituted.

The well known depreciation of the currency at this period was the cause of much embarrassment and alarm. The perplexity and distress occasioned by it are still fresh in the remembrance of many. On the 7th of July, 1779, a meeting was held in Watertown on the subject, and a committee appointed to take the matter into consideration. They reported in favor of acting in accordance with the resolutions that had recently been passed in Boston, and of sending delegates to a Convention to be held at Concord, the next week, for the purpose of devising some means of relief.

* A majority of the votes in the State were in favor of calling a Convention for this purpose. Delegates were accordingly chosen, and met the next September at Cambridge. See Bradford's Hist. of Mass. from 1775 to 1789, p. 177

Other measures were recommended, and the report was accepted. After the meeting at Concord, prices were fixed by a committee, on all the most important articles of traffic, produce, labor, &c.; and no departure from these prices was to be allowed.*

August 23d, 1779, the town appointed two persons to represent them in the Convention, which was to be held on the first of the ensuing September at Cambridge, in order to frame a new constitution, or form of government. Subsequently, instructions were given to these delegates respecting their attendance at the Convention. At the same meeting, delegates were chosen to appear at a meeting to be summoned at Concord on the first Wednesday of the next October, in order to institute further regulations concerning the currency and the prices of articles.

Since the death of the Rev. Mr. Adams, the care of supplying the pulpit had been entrusted to a committee. Among those, whose services were procured at this time, were Mr. Laban Wheaton, who afterward studied the profession of law, and the now venerable Dr. Prince, the present senior pastor of the First Church in Salem, to whom the cause of science among us owes so much, and who is permitted to enjoy the bland and happy old age of the Christian scholar. On the 13th of March, 1780, a meeting was called to make choice of a minister. Mr. Richard Rosewell Eliot, who had officiated in the pulpit during the winter, was unanimously chosen. As nothing is said of any concurrence between the church and society, as separate bodies, on this occasion, perhaps they acted together by one vote. Mr. Eliot, having signified his acceptance of the invitation, was ordained June 21st, 1780. The Rev. Mr. Cushing of Waltham preached the sermon on this occasion: the names of those, who performed the other services, are not remembered.

* See Appendix K.

It may give us some idea of the state of the currency, at that time, to learn that the town appropriated £1600 to defray the expenses of the ordination.

In April, 1781, the town agreed to establish a poor-house upon the south bank of the river, above the bridge. A building was purchased for this purpose, and a vote was passed to remove it to the place designated. It would seem that this was the first poor-house in the town. So long before as May, 1761, it had been determined to erect a work-house : at that time, however, it was not effected ; and when, in January, 1768, the proposal was renewed at a public meeting, it was rejected, and nothing more is said of any similar undertaking till the date above stated. At an adjournment of the same meeting, it was voted "That their representative be directed to use his endeavour in the General Court that the Tender Act, which was lately repealed, be revived so far as it concerns the Tender." The vote was taken by yeas and nays, and the names of the voters on each side were entered on the town records.

Another attempt was made, in March, 1782, to have a part of Newton annexed to Watertown. A committee was appointed to confer with the people at Angier's Corner on the subject, and to join with them, and other inhabitants of Newton, in a petition for this purpose. Nothing appears to have been effected by this movement.

In 1784, a notice occurs of a lottery granted in aid of a plan for enlarging the bridge ; and on the 20th of September, in that year, the town gave the following pledge : "Whereas the General Court have voted a lottery to enlarge the great bridge over Charles River 12 feet, — Voted, that we, the inhabitants of Watertown, will engage to indemnify and save harmless our managers, and that they will agree to take on their own risque, their proportionable part of those tickets, that may remain unsold after the expiration of the

term of time that hath or may be allowed by the General Court; provided the managers account with the town for the expenditure of the money raised by said lottery." The attempt to raise money in this way proved a failure; the tickets were not sold, and the lottery was given up. The matter lingered along till 1791, when the town chose a committee "to look into the affairs of the Watertown Bridge Lottery, and see what losses the managers have sustained"; and soon after they appropriated money to compensate them for these losses, to redeem the tickets, and to pay the charges.

On the 20th of September, 1784, the town voted "to choose a committee to join with the several towns, who are desirous of petitioning the General Court for a repeal of a late act, empowering, or allowing, the town of Boston to exact a toll of persons that supply their market with the necessaries of life." This refers to "An Act for regulating the market in Boston," passed February 18th, 1784, and repealed February 11th, 1785. The Act was opposed and complained of by many of the towns in the country.* In December following, Watertown appointed another committee "to apply, in behalf of the town, to the Corporation of Harvard College to lower the price for passing the ferry between the towns of Charlestown and Boston."

Measures were adopted in town meeting, in 1792, to prevent the spread of the small-pox. Houses were

* The Hon. Mr. Savage has furnished me with a copy of the following "order of notice" on this subject:

"Tuesday, 9 Nov. 1784. Upon the petition of the agents of the towns of Roxbury, Braintree, Stoughton, Dedham, Newton, Weston, Brooklin, Watertown, Needham, Lexington, and Walpole, -- Ordered, that the petitioners serve the Selectmen of the town of Boston with an attested copy of this order by leaving the same with some one of the said Selectmen, 14 days at least before the next setting of the General Court, to appear on the 2d Wednesday of the said next setting of the General Court, to make answer to the said petition if they see cause."

In the margin it is said, "Relative to the Market Act."

provided, to which persons infected with that disease by inoculation were to be removed; and in case they refused to remove themselves, or their families, to the places thus designated by a committee, then the committee were directed to prosecute them, as offenders, at the expense of the town.

The bridge over Charles River had been supported by the joint contributions of Watertown, Waltham, and Weston, the two last mentioned towns having, from the time of their incorporation, borne their share in this expense. In 1797 and 1798, they both made an effort, by petitions to the Legislature, to be liberated from this burden. These petitions were opposed by the people of Watertown, who appointed agents to meet and answer them before the General Court. The relief, which these towns claimed, seems not to have been obtained. But on the 2d of March, 1798, the General Court passed an Act, authorizing the inhabitants of Weston and Waltham, as well as of Watertown, to regulate the fishery "within the limits of the said towns"; and the proceeds accruing from this source were to be divided among the three towns, according to the proportion which each town bore in the expenses of the bridge. This Act, which made the right in the fishery in each town a joint concern of the three towns, appears to have been considered by the people of Watertown as unjust and oppressive. At a meeting on the 20th of January, 1800, they voted "to appoint a committee to make serious enquiry into the constitutionality of the Act empowering Weston and Waltham to lease the fishery in Watertown." This vote, however, they reconsidered; and in March, of the same year, they proposed, through a committee, to Weston and Waltham, to refer the determination of the question respecting the constitutionality of the Act of March 2d, 1798, to the Judges of the Supreme Court, and to bind themselves to abide by the decision of the Judges. This proposal, it would seem, failed

of success ; for in May following, the same committee, who had been appointed in March, were empowered and directed by Watertown to bring an action against Weston or Waltham, which might be the means of putting to test the constitutionality of the disputed Act. In August, however, the people of Watertown voted to make a proposition to Weston and Waltham for "a settlement or compromise respecting the bridge and fishery"; and the committee designated for this purpose were empowered, in March, 1801, to give to Weston and Waltham a complete and sufficient discharge for ever from any further expense in maintaining the bridge over Charles River, provided those towns would give up to Watertown all the privileges in the fishery, which were granted to them in common with Watertown by the Act of March, 1798. On the basis of these conditions a mutual agreement, or obligation, was drawn up with great formality and precision, and signed by the agents of the three towns respectively. This agreement was read to the people of Watertown at a public meeting on the 15th of March, 1802, when they voted to accept the contract, and place it on record. The dispute was thus adjusted satisfactorily to all parties, and their subsequent proceedings were governed by this contract for several years. At length, by an Act of the General Court, dated February 3d, 1816, the right in the fishery was secured and appropriated to Watertown within the limits of the town, and Weston and Waltham were discharged from any further cost or charge towards the support of the bridge over Charles River in Watertown. This is the footing, on which the matter now stands.

The manner in which the property in the pews had been disposed of when the meeting-house was finished in 1755, proved the occasion of some difficulty, after the lapse of nearly fifty years. The pews had not been purchased by those who occupied them, but

had been assigned to the individuals by the town, according to the proportion each one had borne in the whole cost of the meeting-house. This mode of conveying the pews to the individual owners appears to have been vague and informal ; and in process of time cases occurred, which gave rise to the question, whether the property in the pews obtained in this way was of such a nature that it could be transmitted by inheritance, or whether it was limited to the lifetime of the original owner. The difficulty growing out of this question was probably before the town in May, 1795, when they voted "to take council concerning the state of the pews in Watertown meeting-house." The committee chosen at that time were directed to consult Mr. Parsons and Mr. Dexter, and to obtain a written opinion from them on the subject. "Some other gentlemen at the bar" were likewise to be consulted. From some cause the business seems to have proceeded very slowly ; for it was not till March, 1799, that Mr. Parsons and Mr. Dexter communicated their written opinion, in which they said that the original manner of assigning the pews did not appear to them to have the forms "necessary in deeds to create an estate of inheritance," and that the votes of the town alone "could not be legally construed as giving an estate beyond the life of the grantee." In consequence of this opinion from such high sources, and in order to obviate all future uncertainty and difficulty, the town passed a vote; whereby they "give, grant, and confirm" to the original proprietors, and to their heirs and assignees for ever, the pews which they severally drew or held in the meeting-house, excepting those pews which had reverted to the town ; and these were in like manner confirmed to the individuals who had purchased them of the town, and to their heirs, &c. This vote was in April, 1800.

In 1811, a proposal to build a new meeting-house for the town was under discussion. But the commit-

tee, to whom the subject was referred, reported against the project, and it was abandoned.

The site of the United States' Arsenal in Watertown was selected early in 1816, by Major Talcot, who was stationed in the vicinity for the purpose of taking the charge of the establishment. In June of the same year, the State of Massachusetts ceded to the United States the jurisdiction usual in such cases over an extent of territory, which should not exceed sixty acres. The work was begun immediately after this cession; and in 1820, the buildings were completed. Mr. Alexander Parris of Boston was employed as architect; and the whole was finished under the superintendence of Major Talcot, the first commander of the post. At present, somewhat more than forty acres of land are in possession of the United States at this place. A new magazine has been erected during the last year. The two magazines are of stone, and of the best construction; the other buildings are of brick. There are two large storehouses, two buildings for officers' quarters, two barracks, two workshops, and a few other small buildings. They are placed on the four sides of a parallelogram, which face the cardinal points, the spaces between the buildings being filled by a wall fifteen feet in height. The area enclosed is about three hundred and fifty feet by two hundred and eighty feet. The magazines are placed at the distance of several hundred feet from the other buildings. This establishment is both a *depôt* and an arsenal of construction.*

In May, 1817, two hundred dollars were assessed, in addition to the usual tax, for the supply of the pulpit during the ill state of the Rev. Mr. Eliot's health.

The name of Dr. Marshall Spring was so much and so long connected with public interests, both in his profession and in civil affairs, that the notice of it may

* These particulars respecting the Arsenal were communicated by Major Craig, the present much respected commander of the post.

with propriety belong to this narrative. He was born in Watertown, February 19th, 1741-2, was graduated at Harvard College in 1762, and died on the 11th of January, 1818, aged 76 years. After leaving college, he selected the profession of physic and surgery, to the study of which he devoted himself with assiduity. He resided for a short time at St. Eustatia, and then returned to Watertown, where he spent the remainder of his life. He received great assistance from Dr. Josiah Converse, his maternal uncle, and afterward inherited his property. Dr. Spring became one of the most distinguished physicians in the country; and perhaps no one can be mentioned, in whose judgment and skill a more unreserved confidence was placed. His practice was very extensive, and his house was the resort of great numbers of patients from the neighbouring and from distant towns. He was remarkable for a peculiar sagacity of mind, and for acute observation of human nature. These qualities influenced his medical practice, which is said to have been, in many respects, original, and so different from established modes as sometimes to draw upon him obloquy from his professional brethren. But the extraordinary success, which so often attended his mode of treating diseases, served to vindicate his judgment, and secured for him confidence. His strong good sense, and directness of mind, gave him a disgust for whatever savoured of pedantry, or of empty formality, in the profession. It was the fortune of Dr. Spring to be somewhat connected with political affairs. At the time of the Revolution, he was a decided tory, and thought the attempt of the colonies to gain independence entirely rash, and inexpedient. He despaired of success in an enterprise, which to the timid or prudent seemed so hopeless, and which even the sanguine acknowledged to be full of perilous uncertainty. He avowed his opinions on this subject so freely and fearlessly, that it is supposed he would

have been sent out of the country, under the law made for that purpose in 1776, had he not been too important, as a medical man, to be spared. In 1789 he was chosen a member of the Massachusetts Convention on the question concerning the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. Dr. Spring was opposed to the Constitution, because he deemed it deficient in the principles necessary for strength and permanence. In the great political division of the country at the change of the administration in 1801, he took the side of the predominant party; and when reminded, by a political opponent, of the inconsistency between this conduct and his former toryism, he replied that "the voice of the people was as much the voice of God now, as in 1776." He was, for several years, a member of the Executive Council of Massachusetts, and discharged his duties in that station with talent and fidelity. In the sharp encounter of wit, in the ready and pungent repartee of free conversation, Dr. Spring is said to have had very few equals. He was highly respected and beloved till his death, by a numerous circle of friends and associates; and many there are, who will never forget the benevolence of his character, the playful amenity of his temper, and the charm which he spread over social intercourse.*

The Rev. Richard Rosewell Eliot died on the 21st of October, 1818, aged 66 years, and in the 39th year of his ministry. His funeral sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Stearns of Lincoln. He was born at New Haven, Conn., October 8th, 1752, and descended in a direct line from the Rev. John Eliot, the memorable Apostle to the Indians, whose name and whose praise will never die in the ecclesiastical history of New England. Mr. Eliot was fitted for college under the instruction of the Rev. Mr. Frost of Mendon, and was graduated at Cambridge in 1774, being

* A more ample account of Dr. Spring may be found in Dr. Thacher's *American Medical Biography*, Vol. II. p. 98.

a classmate of Mr. Adams, his predecessor in the ministry. After leaving college, he taught a school at Woodstock, Con., and at the same time pursued the study of divinity under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Leonard of that place. In 1779, he was appointed a tutor in Harvard College, and held that office at the time when he received and accepted the call to settle in Watertown. He then attracted much attention as an orator, and is said to have been surpassed by few in the gifts and graces of good speaking, a power which the infirm state of his health, and other causes, withheld him from cultivating in the subsequent part of his life. Mr. Eliot's theological views were liberal and enlarged. For the harsh and stern features, which are sometimes portrayed as belonging to the countenance of religion, he had no partiality. He dwelt with peculiar pleasure on the benevolence and the paternal character of the Deity, and considered divine truth as presenting, in all its aspects, winning encouragement no less than awful solemnity. Metaphysical and ethical subjects were among his favorite studies; and in these, he is said sometimes to have displayed no inconsiderable acuteness and discrimination. His preaching was judicious, evangelical, and for the most part practical; and if his manner generally failed to be interesting or impressive, it should be remembered that the very feeble condition of his health precluded, in a great degree, that energy of delivery, which to most hearers is necessary to render even truth attractive. The style, in which his sermons were written, was perspicuous, easy, and pure, marked by the good taste of the school of Addison, and free from false ornaments and from the artifices of composition. His mind was active, and his feelings occasionally ardent, notwithstanding the depressing influence of a wasted bodily frame; and he was peculiarly disposed to interest himself in mechanical inventions, and in certain plans of improvement. His life might almost be regarded

as one long disease ; and when we consider with what a leaden weight constant illness hangs upon the spirit, how it paralyzes resolution, and wears away drop by drop, as it were, the interests which men take in the scenes and engagements of life, can we wonder, or can we find no apology, if he did not accomplish so much, or labor with so effectual force, as those may, to whom God grants the blessings of a sound constitution and good health? His virtues and his piety were of a retiring, quiet character ; his disposition was kind and amiable ; and he was a man of sincere and honest heart. He treated with respect and fairness the feelings of others, and he bore suffering and disappointment with the submission of a Christian. Mr. Eliot was reluctant to commit any of his productions to the press. His published writings, accordingly, are few, but are very respectable compositions, both in manner and matter. They are the following : “ A Discourse delivered at Athol at the Consecration of a Lodge, Oct. 13, 1803.” “ A Discourse delivered at Dedham, at the Consecration of Constellation Lodge, Oct. 19th, 1803.” “ Two Sermons preached at Watertown, Sept. 30th, and Oct. 7th, 1810,” from Acts, ii. 47 : “ Two Sermons preached at Watertown, Sept. 22d, 1816,” from Deuteronomy xxxii. 47. In the third of these is presented a very lucid and judicious view of the nature of a Christian church, and of the character which appertains to the ordinance of the Supper. From the last, published about two years before his death, is taken the following extract, which is honorable to the feelings of his heart, as a minister : “ When I look round on the people of my charge, and view them as pilgrims on their passage to a state of recompense and retribution, when I consider that during the space of more than thirty-six years I have been with them, in all seasons and in innumerable vicissitudes, have shared in their griefs, sorrows, and adversities, and have experienced their kind attention and

affectionate aids, when I have been called to pass through the furnace of afflictions,—when I consider how many of my parishioners have already been joined to the congregation of the dead, how soon those who have been brought up under my ministry and who still continue among the living, must pass into the invisible and eternal world, how soon my ministerial labors must come to a close, and how soon I shall be required, by an impartial and unerring Judge, to give an account of my stewardship, my feelings are unutterable!”

There are recorded by Mr. Eliot, during his ministry, 497 baptisms and 118 received to the church.*

After the death of Mr. Eliot the pulpit was supplied by various candidates for the ministry. On the 12th of April, 1819, the town voted to invite the writer of this narrative to settle with them in the Gospel ministry, the church having previously, on the 31st of March, made a nomination to that effect. The invitation was accepted, and the ordination took place on the 23d of June, 1819. The introductory prayer was offered by the Rev. Dr. Lowell of Boston; the Rev. Dr. Osgood of Medford preached the sermon, from 1 Timothy, i. 15.† The Rev. Dr. Kirkland, President of Harvard College, offered the ordaining prayer; the Rev. Dr. Ripley of Concord delivered the charge; the Rev. Mr. Palfrey of Boston gave the right hand of fellowship; and the Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham offered the concluding prayer.

In the summer of 1819, the meeting-house was enlarged by an addition of 16 feet in width. This enlargement afforded space for the erection of 16 new pews on the lower floor. The alteration was made

* The body of Mr. Eliot was deposited in the tomb of John Richardson, Esq. His widow still resides in Watertown.

† This sermon was printed at the request of the society, and was the last production published by the venerable and eloquent preacher. He died December 12th, 1822.

by persons, who entered into a contract for the purpose with a committee appointed by the town.

The meeting-house erected in Watertown by the Watertown and Newton Universalist society was dedicated on the 15th of August, 1827. On the same day the Rev. Russell Streeter was installed as pastor. The church was publicly recognised July 23d, 1828. The connexion of the Rev. Mr. Streeter with the society was dissolved in 1829; and on the 15th of May, 1830, the Rev. William S. Balch, their present pastor, was installed.

On the 19th of August, 1830, the meeting-house erected by a Baptist society in Watertown was dedicated, and the Rev. Peter Chase was installed as their pastor. A church was formed at the same time.

On the 17th of September, 1830, the inhabitants of Watertown commemorated the completion of the second century from the settlement of the town. An address was delivered by the Congregational Minister, at the request of the Selectmen; and religious services, adapted to the occasion, were performed by the Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham, and the Rev. Mr. Balch and the Rev. Mr. Chase of Watertown.

The humble narrative, which has now been brought to a close,* may suggest considerations of some practical importance. The history of a town is indeed but a small item on the broad records of man's doings,—so small, that many will regard the interest taken in it as mere antiquarian trifling. But it is not without its use, at least to those who live on the spot, to which the narrative belongs. Our towns are the minute sections of a great community, each of which has an influence and an interest, however inconsiderable, in the welfare of the whole. They are the nurseries of the state, sending forth a continual supply of members to act and to be acted upon, amidst the complicated trans-

* See Appendix L.

actions and improvements of the country. These little subdivisions are the elementary parts of that mighty and unwieldy mass, which we call the nation; and in proportion as the parts are made sound and pure, the whole receives a firmer and more healthy character. In our community and under our institutions, this is peculiarly true. So free and numerous are the channels of intercourse through a body politic, in which men have equal rights, that scarcely the most inconsiderable fragment of society can be said to stand alone. The village has a bearing on the nation, and the nation on the village. The inhabitants of every town, therefore, should feel that they have relations to sustain, and duties to perform, of no unimportant nature. The sacred interests of knowledge, of rational freedom, and of religion, they should cherish with the deepest solicitude of which the heart of man is capable. They should never forget, that upon the members of every family, upon the inmates of every home, lies a solemn responsibility to their country and to God,—that the domestic establishment is a seminary, which sends forth its pupils through the land, and the influence of which, in extent and duration, can scarcely be measured.

The care of education is a precious trust, for which our towns, each and all, are accountable. While they maintain a watchful concern in the cause of knowledge, they are doing good not only to themselves, but to the whole land. A power is thus put in operation, which seeks out and draws forth the talents of every portion of the community, which reaches forth a helping hand to the minds marked by God for usefulness and distinction, and calls them to the service of society; and by doing this from generation to generation, perpetuates a race of vigorous and enlightened guardians of good institutions. It is this, which fans into a bright and beautiful flame the spark of intellect, that might otherwise be smothered, or burn dimly, in secret places. It is this, which spreads far and wide that enlight-

ened energy of character, upon which must ever rest the strong defence of the high interests of humanity. The memorable example of our fathers, in this respect, is worthy of all praise. Scarcely had they felled the forest sufficiently to prepare room for their poor and scattered dwellings, when they turned their thoughts anxiously to the care of education. In the midst of distress and danger, when, it might be supposed, they had enough to do in procuring bread to eat and in defending themselves from the savages, they laid the foundation of our venerable University and of schools, the blessings of which are now a rich part of our inheritance. The means of learning took root among the deep foundations of the republic, and grew and flourished with it. We may not forget, that they belong essentially, not to its ornament only, but to its welfare, and that they cannot be slighted without peril to all we hold most dear.

It should be remembered, however, that higher interests than those of knowledge are committed, as an inestimable deposit, to every town among us ; I mean the interests of morals and religion. Here, too, the state has a claim upon all its parts ; for religion belongs to the community, and blesses the community. They make but a defective estimate, who treat it merely as a concern between the individual and his God. It is this ; but it is likewise more than this. It is a matter between the members of society, as such, a matter in which they have a strong mutual interest. Religion goes beyond the breast of the individual and beyond the family circle. It travels through society, and scatters blessings as it goes ; it gives security to rights, to property, and to enjoyments ; it controls if it does not extinguish the passions from which spring encroachment and oppression ; it acts upon the whole while it acts upon the parts, and spreads the broad wing of its love over the community at large, as well as over your own dwelling. Such views of its agen-

cy are too often excluded, or their importance underrated, by the narrowness of sectarian feeling, or in the eagerness of party triumph. The subject was not regarded thus by our ancestors. They considered religion as the best friend and ally of their civil institutions, as the sanctifier and the protector of whatever they valued most highly in their political privileges. And they judged rightly. We surely want something to penetrate the whole mass of society, and operate as a restraint upon that pestilent ambition, which aims only at self-aggrandizement, and, so it can but build a triumphal arch to its own glory, cares not how abject and miserable are the crowds that gaze upon it. We want something that will give a solemn sanction to sound and wholesome laws, and to the sacred institutions of order and justice. We want something, that will prevent passion or selfishness from sweeping away the landmarks of venerable principles, that will not suffer licentiousness, under the abused name of freedom, to confound the essential distinctions, which God has instituted in the very nature of human society. The power, that will do all this, is to be found only in moral and religious influence, an influence guarded and guided so wisely, that it shall surround us like the air we breathe, vitally important, and felt not by its pressure, but by its refreshing and beneficial agency. None of the shackles, imposed by creeds, or by the spirit of a party, can supply the place of this great moral power. The people of every village should feel the solemn obligation of cherishing this guardian of their best possessions, and at the same time they should remember, that the spirit, miscalled religion, which kindles the wild-fire of strife and fanaticism from town to town, is as far from resembling the beneficent agency of true Christianity, as the burning fever is from resembling the healthful and natural action of the functions of the body.

The principles, which have been stated, are the essential sources of all the good we can wish for our

country. These are the support of the privileges and institutions, which make our country worthy of our love. They are inseparably associated with the memory of our fathers, who through successive generations watched with pious care over the church of Christ, and kept a sleepless eye fixed on the blessings of freedom. Whatever there is of honest fame, or of virtuous excitement, in their sufferings and deeds ; whatever their example affords, to which the nations of the earth point, as to a source of instruction and a beacon of hope ; whatever is registered of their high enterprise, their noble daring, their firm endurance ; all these become the nutriment of a consecrated patriotism, when they are regarded as the expression of strong devotedness to the cause of knowledge, of truth, and of piety. It is thus that the feeling becomes a hallowed one, which connects us with the men of former days, — men who have left the impression of their wisdom and valor on their own age, and on succeeding ages, who set forth and defended principles, the power of which is now felt in every fibre of the community, and who, in times when the hearts of multitudes quaked within them for fear, looked unmoved on danger and death, resting on a sublime sense of duty, and on the arm of Almighty God.

In the same elevated spirit the Christian citizen can look forward to the future. His blessings rise to a higher value, and glow with a richer beauty, when he can hope that they will be transmitted to his children's children, encompassed and strengthened by the helps of knowledge and piety. His regard to the public welfare thus acquires something of the nature of parental affection, blending with its serious and perhaps stern expression the mildness of that feeling, which looks with fond care to coming generations. We should love our country, as Christians and as enlightened men. We should show this love, not by hating and reviling other nations, not by idle vapping and

swelling boasts, not by plunging with mad zeal into the conflicts of party ; remembering that if it be truly said,

Faction will freedom, like its shade, pursue,
Yet, like the shadow, proves the substance true,

it is also the fearful lesson of history, that faction is often the assassin, as well as the companion, of liberty. We must manifest a love for our native land in other and better ways, — by cleaving fast to principles and institutions established by the labors of the wise, and sanctified by the prayers of the pious, and by such a use of our gifts and privileges, that those who are to come after us, may have as much good and as little evil to tell of us, as we have to tell of our ancestors. We must remember, that the good man is the best patriot ; that fidelity in the use of our extraordinary blessings will teach us most effectually how to prize and to preserve the fair inheritance transmitted from the Fathers of New England.

APPENDIX.

(A, page 12.)

The following is a list of the names, with the quantity of land assigned to each, in a "grant of the Plowlands at Beverbroke Plaines, devided and lotted out by the Freeman to all the Townesmen then inhabiting, being 106 in number."—February 28, 1636.

	Acres.		Acres.
George Phillips, pastor,	forty.	Francis Smith,	eight.
John Whitney,	ten.	John Eaton,	six.
Thomas Hastings,	two.	John Loveran,	twenty.
Richard Woodward,	six.	William Jennison,	ten.
Robert Betts,	one.	John Page,	thirteen.
John Grigs,	one.	Samuel Hosier,	five.
John Simson,	four.	John Winkell,	three.
Charles Chadwick,	three.	John Goffe,	four.
Robert Veazy,	one.	Nathaniel Bowman,	seven.
Henry Goldstone,	seven.	Brian Pembleton,	twelve.
John Smith, Sen.,	four.	Richard Browne,	nine.
John Tomson,	two.	John Lawrence,	three.
John Eddy,	nine.	John Tucker,	three.
William Bassum,	three.	Thomas Cakebred,	eight.
Benjamin Crispe,	three.	Robert Tuck,	five.
Edmund Sherman,	six.	Henry Cuttris,	one.
William Bridges,	five.	Richard Kemball,	twelve.
Gregory Taylor,	five.	John Barnard,	ten.
John Coolige,	five.	Edward Dikes,	three.
Daniel Patrick,	fourteen.	Thomas Brookes,	four.
Joseph Mosse,	two.	Timothy Hawkins,	two.
Ephraim Child,	sixteen.	Gregory Stone,	ten.
Robert Lockwood,	six.	James Cutter,	three.
Francis Onge,	six.	John Cutting,	ten.
John Gay,	five.	Daniel Perse,	one.
Simon Eire,	eighteen.	Barnaby Windes,	six.
Sir Richard Saltonstall	thirty.	John Kingsberry,	six.
Nathaniel Baker,	five.	Robert Feke,	twenty-four.
John Richardson,	three.	Isaac Stone,	eleven.
George Munnings,	four.	Thomas Smith,	two.
Henry Bright,	three.	John Rose,	three.
Nicholls Knapp,	six.	Miles Nutt,	three.
Richard Sawtle,	one.	John Hayward,	seven.
John Ellett,	four.	Thomas Filbrick,	nine.

Simon Stone,	fourteen.	John Smith, Jun.,	one.
Robert Daniel,	eight.	Roger Willington,	two.
Isaac Mixer,	four.	Christopher Grant,	three.
Edward How,	twenty-four.	John Nichols,	four.
Henry Dengayne,	one.	John Dwight,	seven.
Thomas Maihew,	thirty.	Foster Pickram,	five.
John Stowars,	two.	John Springe,	six.
Richard Beere,	two.	John Warner,	seven.
Edmund James,	five.	Emanuel White,	three.
John Firmin,	nine.	Edward Garfield,	seven.
John Warrin,	thirteen.	William Gutterig,	three.
John Batcheler,	six.	Hugh Mason,	three.
William Knop,	seven.	Thomas Rogers,	five.
Henry Kembal,	six.	Thomas Bartlett,	two.
William Palmer,	one.	John Doggett,	six.
Edmund Lewis,	five.	Lawrence Waters,	four.
John Finch,	four.	Martin Underwood,	two.
William Swift,	five.	William Paine,	twenty-four.
John Winter,	three.	Garrett Church,	two.
Edward Lam,	three.	Abram Shaw,	ten.

Though the number is stated to be 106, it will be found, on counting, to be 108.

(B, page 13.)

The confusion on this question arises from the apparently contradictory testimonies of the old writers, and from the vague character of some of their expressions. Dr. Kendal, in the body of his *Century Discourse*, considers the church in Watertown as the *sixth* in age, among the Massachusetts churches; but in a note of some length, the fruit of subsequent researches, he assigns to it an earlier date, and is disposed even to regard it as second only to that at Salem. In this last estimate he is, however, undoubtedly in an error. The mistakes of Johnson, (Wonder-working Providence,) in his arrangement of the churches, are now generally acknowledged; and if his testimony be set aside, as it probably should be, the opinions which others have built on his authority as to this point, must fall with it. Mather (*Magnal. B. III. ch. 4.*) says that the Rev. Mr. Phillips and the other settlers of Watertown, on the 30th of July, 1630, "upon a day set apart for solemn fasting and prayer, the very next month after they came ashore, entered into this holy covenant." He then subjoins the covenant at length, and adds, that "about forty men then subscribed this instrument in order unto their coalescence into a church-estate." The day here designated was that, which Governor Winthrop had appropriated for fasting and prayer on ac-

count of the prevalent sickness, and on which Winthrop, Dudley, Johnson, and Wilson "first entered into church covenant, and laid the foundation of the churches both of Charlestown and afterwards of Boston." (*Prince*, p. 310, &c.) At the same time Sir Richard Saltonstall, and others of the settlement at Watertown, subscribed a covenant. Mather's statement, as to the origin of the Watertown church, would seem to be explicit and decisive of the question. But, in a note at the end of Dr. Kendal's Discourse, Dr. Holmes, to whose faithful and valuable labors on the early history of this country high praise is due, has endeavoured to show that the transaction to which Mather's account relates, was not the actual formation of a church, but merely an exercise preparatory to that act. His reasoning certainly deserves much consideration, and is stated with fairness and strength. Yet it does not seem to me entirely satisfactory and convincing. Although, as he remarks, the fast on the 30th of July related not primarily to ecclesiastical matters, but to the prevalent sickness, yet the strong expressions used by the writers, from whom we have the account, certainly seem to imply nothing less than the actual formation of churches. According to Prince, it was considered an important object in keeping the fast, "that such godly persons among them, as know each other, may publicly at the end of their exercise make known their desire, and practise the same by solemnly entering into covenant with God to walk in his ways," &c. ; and though their society consisted of very few, they promised, "after to receive in such by confession of faith, as shall appear to be fully qualified." This last engagement implies, that they intended from that day to be regarded as an organized church, prepared to receive others into their number. Morton, in relating the same transaction, tells us, that their purpose was to seek "for direction and guidance in the solemn enterprize of entering into church fellowship." (*New England's Memorial*, Davis's ed. p. 159.) Language like this appears decisively to describe the formation of churches ; and if it were not intended to do so, it is unguarded and ambiguous. Mather introduces his account by remarking, that "they [Mr. Phillips and others of the Watertown settlers] resolved that they would *combine into a church fellowship* there as their first work," &c. ; and when he remarks, that "in after time they, that joined unto the church, subscribed a form of the covenant somewhat altered, with a confession of faith annexed unto it," this refers, I conceive, not to a subsequent process of forming a church, but merely to some modifications in their covenant, introduced perhaps to make it more explicit and satisfactory. There is, however, another account given by Mather, which is inconsistent

with his own statement, above quoted, as to the state of the Watertown church. He places (Book I. ch. 5.) the churches at Charlestown, Dorchester, Boston, Roxbury, and Lynn, before that at Watertown, in the order of time. I know not how this inconsistency is to be explained, but by supposing that Mather, in the arrangement of the churches just referred to, followed, without examination, some erroneous authority. We seem warranted to infer that in the account, which assigns the Watertown church to July 30, 1630, he was more likely to be correct, because, in that account, a specific date is given for the transaction, connected with the well-attested fact of the fast which was observed on that day ; whereas, in the other account, a merely general statement is made of one church following another, without any date assigned to either, except the Charlestown church. On the whole, I cannot but conclude, that the true date of the formation of the Watertown church is July 30, 1630, O. S. With regard to the relative positions of the first churches in Massachusetts, in the order of time, information may be found in Dr. Kendal's *Century Discourse*, p. 19 ; *Mass. Hist. Collections*, 2d Series, Vol. I. pp. 9, 25 ; and *Savage's note on Winthrop*, Vol. I. p. 94.

The covenant mentioned above as recorded by Mather, into which Mr. Phillips and others entered, and which was the foundation of this ancient church of our fathers, is so remarkable for its hearty piety, and its entire freedom from a sectarian spirit, that I have thought proper to insert it in this connexion. It is as follows :

“*July 30, 1630.*

“We, whose names are hereto subscribed, having, through God's mercy, escaped out of the pollutions of the world, and been taken into the society of his people, with all thankfulness do hereby, both with heart and hand, acknowledge that his gracious goodness and fatherly care towards us ; and, for further and more full declaration thereof to the present and future ages, have undertaken (for the promoting of his glory, and the church's good, and the honour of our blessed Jesus, in our more full and free subjecting of ourselves and ours under his gracious government, in the practice of and obedience unto all his holy ordinances and orders, which he hath pleased to prescribe and impose upon us) a long and hazardous voyage from east to west, from Old England in Europe, to New England in America ; that we may walk before him, and serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness, all the days of our lives : and being safely arrived here, and thus far onwards peaceably preserved by his special providence, that we may bring forth our intentions into actions, and perfect our

resolutions in the beginnings of some just and meet executions, we have separated the day above written from all other services, and dedicated it wholly to the Lord in divine employments, for a day of afflicting our souls, and humbling ourselves before the Lord, to seek him, and at his hands a way to walk in, by fasting and prayer, that we might know what was good in his sight; and the Lord was entreated of us. For in the end of that day, after the finishing of our publick duties, we do all, before we depart, solemnly, and with all our hearts, personally, man by man, for ourselves and ours, (charging them before Christ and his elect angels, even them that are not here with us this day, or are yet unborn, that they keep the promise unblameably and faithfully, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus,) promise, and enter into a sure covenant with the Lord our God, and, before him, with one another, by oath and serious protestation made, to renounce all idolatry and superstition, will-worship, all humane traditions and inventions whatsoever in the worship of God; and forsaking all evil ways, do give ourselves wholly unto the Lord Jesus, to do him faithful service, observing and keeping all his statutes, commands, and ordinances, in all matters concerning our reformation, his worship, administrations, ministry, and government, and in the carriage of ourselves among ourselves and one towards another, as he hath prescribed in his holy word. Further swearing to cleave unto *that* alone, and the true sense and meaning thereof to the utmost of our power, as unto the most clear light, and infallible rule, and all-sufficient canon, in all things that concern us in this our way. In witness of all, we do *ex animo* and in the presence of God hereto set our names or marks, in the day and year above written."

(C, page 17.)

The following is the letter alluded to, taken from the Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Series: vol. iv. p. 171.

"Reverend and deare friends, whom I unfaynedly love and respect. It doth not a little grieve my spirit to heare what sadd things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecutions in New England, as that you fyne, whip, and imprison men for their consciences. First you compel such to come into your assemblies, as you know will not joyne with you in your worship, and when they shew their dislike thereof or witness against it, then you styrre up your magistrates to punish them for such (as you conceyve) their publick affronts. Truly, friends, this

your practice of compelling any in matters of worship to doe that whereof they are not fully persuaded is to make them sin, for soe the apostle (Rom. 14 and 23) tells us, and many are made hypocrites thereby, conforming in their outward man for feare of punishment. We pray for you and wish you prosperitie every way, hoped the Lord would have given you so much light and love there, that you might have been eyes to God's people here, and not to practice those courses in a wilderness, which you went so farre to prevent. These rigid wayes have layed you very lowe in the hearts of the saynts. I doe assure you I have heard them pray in the publike assemblies, that the Lord would give you meeke and humble spirits, not to stryve so much for uniformity, as to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

“When I was in Holland about the beginning of the warres, I remember some christians there, that then had serious thoughts of planting in New England, desired me to write to the governor thereof to know if those that differ from you in opinion, yet holding the same foundation in religion, as Anabaptists, Seekers, Antinomians, and the like, might be permitted to live among you; to which I received this short answer from your then governor, Mr. Dudley, God forbid (said he) our love for the truth should be grown so could, that we should tolerate errorrs; and when (for satisfaction of myself and others) I desired to know your grounds, he referred me to the books written here between the Presbyterians and Independents, which if that had been sufficient, I needed not have sent soe farre to understand the reasons of your practice. I hope you do not assume to yourselves infallibilitie of judgment, when the most learned of the apostles confesseth he knew but in parte and saw but darkely as through a glass. Oh that all those who are brethren, though yet they cannot thinke and speake the same things, might be of one accord in the Lord. Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be thus minded towards one another, after the example of Jesus Christ our blessed Savyor, in whose everlasting armes of protection he leaves you who will never leave to be

Your truly and much affectionate friend
in the nearest union

RIC : SALTONSTALL.

For my Reverend and worthily much esteemed friends, Mr. Cotton and Mr. Wilson, preachers to the church which is at Boston in New-England.”

(D, page 32.)

It is proper here to advert to the use which has been made of the case of Briscoe, in a pamphlet entitled "Vindication of the Rights of the Churches of Christ," published at Boston, 1828. The writer considers the statement of Winthrop and Hubbard in this instance as furnishing decisive evidence, that *the churches* (taking the word in its limited sense, as signifying only the communicants,) were regarded as bodies politic, and exercised the power of levying a tax for the support of their pastors. It is not necessary here to go into an examination of this position. The arguments, by which the writer attempts to sustain it, have been most satisfactorily refuted in a very able Review of the pamphlet, published in the "Christian Examiner," for 1828, vol. v. p. 500, &c. I will only remark, that the writer of the "Vindication" seems to have mistaken the object of Briscoe's complaint, which was against the tax itself, not against the power by which it was imposed. The support of the ministers had before been drawn from voluntary contributions; and when a tax was introduced compelling every man to pay his proportion for this purpose, Briscoe found fault with the change, as an offensive and injurious innovation. This was the object of his opposition, which therefore furnishes no evidence in favor of the abovementioned position, since the power of the church to raise money was not the point in debate. It is true that Winthrop, and Hubbard who merely copies Winthrop, speak of Briscoe as being grieved because he and others were taxed, when they "were *no members*." Much stress is laid on this expression to show that the church, distinctively so called, possessed and exercised the power in question. But the expression, in all probability, was used concerning a relation to the religious society, as such, in Watertown, not to the body of the communicants exclusively. When the tax was introduced, and payment demanded by the proper authorities of the town, it is probable that Briscoe and others, in the warmth of their resentment, separated themselves from their former connexion, and declared they would have nothing to do with the support of the ministry or of public worship. They therefore considered themselves as "no members," and were angry because the tax was still required of them. It is an extreme jealousy of taxation, and not resistance to a power exercised by the church, which appears in Briscoe's case. The town records show decisively, that the appropriations for the support of the ministry were made by the town, as such, not by the church, as a distinct body. The tax for this purpose in 1642 (the very year in question) was or-

dered at a town meeting, in which other town affairs were transacted, such as choosing Selectmen, appointing persons to pack and sell leather, &c. ; and, in 1648, "at a *general towne meeting*, the *towne* granted to Paster Knowles and Paster Sherman 120 pounds for the yeare following, to be equally divided between them ; the said sum to be raised *by rate made by the seven men*" (meaning the Selectmen). There is nowhere in the records an intimation of *the church*, peculiarly so called, pretending to hold or exercise the power of raising money by tax for the support of their pastors. On the contrary, this is uniformly mentioned as the town's affair, and disposed of among other town business.

(E, page 50.)

The body of the Rev. Mr. Sherman was deposited in the old burying-ground in Watertown, and a plain monument raised over it, which, having fallen into decay, was rebuilt in 1821. His epitaph is said by the Rev. John Bailey, in a book of records kept by him, to have been written by Mr. Willard, doubtless the Rev. Samuel Willard, pastor of the Old South Church in Boston, who was married to a daughter of Mr. Sherman. It is as follows :—

Johannis Shermanni maximæ pietatis, gravitatis, et candoris viri,
in theologiâ plurimum versati :
in concionando verè Chrysostomi :
in Artibus liberalibus præcipuè Mathematicis incomparabilis :
Aquitamensis ecclesiæ in Nov. Angliâ fidelissimi pastoris :
Collegii Harvardini inspectoris. et socii :
Qui postquam annis plus minus XLV Christo fuit Ἐπηρίτης *
in ecclesiâ fidus
Morte maturâ transmigravit,
et à Christo palmâ decoratus est,
A. D. MDCLXXXV Augusti,
Ætatis suæ LXXII :
Memoriæ.

Mather, at the close of his account of Sherman, has bestowed

* Immediately after this word Mr. Bailey, who transcribed this epitaph into his manuscript book, has inserted in a parenthesis the following comment ; "i. e. one of the underrowers that steer the ship towards the haven." In thus explaining this Greek word according to its derivation, rather than in its common and obvious sense, he has made it present to the mind a metaphor somewhat striking and pleasing.

upon him the following epitaph, borrowed, with the alteration of the name, from its application to another person :

Ut Pauli Pietas, sic Euclidea Mathesis,
Uno Shermanni conditur in Tumulo.

It may not be improper to insert here an epitaph on the Rev. Jonathan Mitchell of Cambridge, written, as I suppose, by the Rev. Mr. Sherman. I am induced to think it to be from his hand, because Hubbard (p. 606) ascribes it to "a neighbour minister," and because it is subscribed with the initials J. S. If it be Sherman's, it may lead us to fear that his philosophy and mathematics had not altogether fitted him for a poet ; although, if compared with the sepulchral inscriptions in verse which were common at that period, it will certainly appear very respectable.

Here lies the darling of his time,
Mitchell, expired in his prime,
Who, four years short of forty-seven,
Was found full ripe, and pluck'd for heaven ;
Was full of prudent zeal, and love,
Faith, patience, wisdom from above ;
New England's stay, next age's story,
The churches' gem, the college glory.
Angels may speak him, ah ! not I,
(Whose worth's above hyperbole,)
But for our loss, were 't in my power,
I'd weep an everlasting shower.

(F, page 58.)

When Mr. John Bailey came from Ireland to New England, he brought a manuscript book, to which I have already had occasion to refer. In this book he kept a record of all the communions of his church, first in Limerick, beginning June, 1679, and then in Watertown, in regular order till he left the town. In these records are occasionally found some interesting particulars. The following notice, while he was in Ireland, is worthy of being transcribed. "The 44th Sacrament was upon the 11th of Oct., 1683, in the evening, at Mr. Wilkins. It's now too long a story to tell all the particular reasons why we had not one sooner ; many have been the exercises, tryals, vexations, we have met with since July the 1st. There hath a plott broken out since then that hath occasioned a world of trouble, and some have suffered, as Russell, Essex, Capt. Wolcott, &c., and others

are like to suffer ; it hath made the papists proud, &c., but God will, in his own time, discover the worke of darkness ; I say no more of it. We were shutt out of the Abby by the locking of the gates, and it's sad to think we shall never come more into our old place of worship. Then I was advised by the Bishops not to preach ; I promised to forbear a while because of such a criticall juncture of time ; after 3 Sabbaths I began again, &c. and so the Bishop with the broad seall of his court certified to the Mayor, who is very unwilling to do any thing against me, that I did preach such a day, and so required the Act of Uniformity to be putt in force against me in 3 monthes imprisonment. I was sent for before the Mayor, Recorder, and other justices, to whom I opened my mind fully : the Recorder was for imprisonment, but the Mayor was not only willing to forgive what was past, but not to putt me on promising to forbear for the future (for he knew I would not promise it), but to warne me for the future, telling me what to look for if I do so any more. So that now in a sort the very neck of our liberty is broken, for there is little likelihood of doing any thing in private. This is the saddest day I have seen ; all their former wayes have hitherto been abortive, nothing fledged till this. The Lord is performing the thing appointed for me, and yet what this may come to I know not ; but there is just ground of fear, because all things every where goe down the wind." Again he writes :—" The 46th Sacrament was on Jan. 13, 1684, in the morning, at Mr. W's. I was at one of clock to preach in the Irish town ; but I have now nothing to say to this day's worke, for I was imprisoned in the afternoon, and so I suppose it may be the last Sacrament I may give ; many things were said at the Table, which I now being under confinement forbear to repeate," &c. The next record, Oct. 6th, 1686, speaks of his arrival in New England, and of his being " set apart for the church in Watertown." From this time notices follow, in a regular series, of all the communions of the church in Watertown while he was with them. He gives the heads of his sermons and remarks on these occasions, and is so particular as to notice the weather, and other minute circumstances. He speaks frequently of the communion being attended by great numbers of people from the neighbouring and even distant towns. At one time, he says, they were " so many, that they put us hard to it to get elements sufficient."

Mr. Bailey seems to have used this book as a depository for his notes about his private matters, as well as ecclesiastical affairs. It contains the epitaphs upon his wife, who died and was buried in Watertown, and upon his brother Thomas. They were writ-

ten by Mr. Moody, probably the Rev. Joshua Moody, of the First Church in Boston, and are as follows :

Pious Lydia, made and given by God,
 as a most meet help to John Bailey,
 Minister of the Gospel.
 Good betimes, — Best at last,
 Lived by faith, — Died in grace,
 Went off singing, — Left us weeping,
 Walked with God till translated in the 39th yeare
 of her age, April 16, 1691.
 Read her epitaph in Prov. xxxi. 10, 11, 12, 28, 29, 30, 31.

Here lyes the precious dust of Thomas Bailey	
A painful preacher	} { A most desirable neighbour A pleasant companion A common good A cheerful doer A patient sufferer Lived much in little time.
An exemplary liver	
A tender husband	
A careful father	
A brother for adversity	
A faithful friend	

A good copy for all Survivors.

Aged 35 years.

He slept in Jesus the 21. of January 1688.

Among the curious medley contained in this book are some memoranda of Mr. Bailey's expenses ; and at the end of one of these accounts he exclaims, " I'll proceed no further, it's enough to make a man mad to take notice of dayly expenses," &c.

The following entry among his marriage records is worthy of notice. " There was by the General Assembly, sitting in October or November, 1692, an order made for Ministers marrying, as well as Justices of the peace, which hath encouraged me to do it at the importunity of friends," &c. Hutchinson says that, among our ancestors, " there was no instance of marriage by a clergyman, during their charter ; but it was always done by a magistrate, or by persons specially appointed for that purpose, who were confined to particular towns or districts. If a minister happened to be present, he was desired to pray." Vol. i. p. 392.

It may be well to take notice here, that in a blank leaf of Mr. Bailey's book, " Man's Chief End to Glorifie God," &c., presented to the Massachusetts Historical Society, there is the following memorandum respecting his descendants : " Now living of his offspring, in Boston, two great-grand-children, namely, Sarah Belknap and Abigail Willis, and three great-great-grand-children, namely, Charles Willis, Jr., Nathaniel Willis, and Abigail Willis. May 28, 1771."

(G, page 60.)

This report as then presented, respecting both the ministry and the meeting-house, stands in the town records as follows :

“ Whereas in a general Town Meeting of the inhabitants of Watertown, upon the 27th of December last past, it was voted that matters of difference relating to the settling of a minister and the placing of the Meeting-house, should be left to the determination of a committee, to be chosen by the Governor and Council : And whereas upon the application of Mr. William Bond and Lieut. Benjamin Garfield, the Governor and Council were pleased to nominate us the subscribers to be a committee for the ends aforesaid : We do advise and determine, that forasmuch as you have once and again called the Rev. Mr. Henry Gibbs to labour in the Lord's vineyard at Watertown, which he has so far accepted as to spend some years with you, in which time yourselves and others have had plentiful experience of his ability and real worth, that therefore you do your endeavour that he may speedily be fixed among you in the work and office of the ministry.

“ And whereas there has been of a long time, even ever since the dayes of your blessed pastor Phillips, an earnest contending about the place of meeting for the publick worship of God, having heard and duly weighed the allegations of both parties in your publick meeting, and considering the remoteness of the most of your inhabitants from the place where the meeting-house now stands, our advice and determination in that matter is, that within the space of four years next coming there be a meeting-house erected in your town on a knowl of ground lying between the house of the widow Sterns and Whitney's hill,* to be the place of meeting to worship God for the whole town. And if in the mean time, the minister see cause to dwell in the house where the Rev. Mr. John Bayly dwell'd, the town pay rent to the proprietors, as hath been accustomed since its building. So praying God to unite your hearts in his fear, we take leave, who are your truly loving friends and brethren.

Boston, May 18, 1693.

To our Brethren and
Neighbours of Watertown.

WILLIAM STOUGHTON.

JOHN PHILLIPS.

JAMES RUSSELL.

SAMUEL SEWALL.

JOSEPH LYNDE.”

* The spot thus described by the committee was in one of the angles now formed by the intersection of two roads near the houses of Mr. Charles Whitney and Mr. Joel Pierce,—a place sometimes called *the Four Corners*. It is now remembered in the town, that a meeting-house was said to have once stood there.

(H, page 66.)

By the order of the Court in 1700, it would seem, all the inhabitants of the town (except the "the Farmers") were required to choose which of the two places of worship they would support, and then sign their names to an obligation for that purpose. The names of those, who subscribed for the support of the old meeting-house, were as follows :

J. Hammond, Senr.	N. Wyeth.	J. Bacon.
R. Norcross.	J. Goddard.	J. Childs.
S. Stone.	H. Spring.	J. Stone.
N. Barsham.	N. Fiske.	J. Holdin
J. Stratten, Senr.	T. Train.	C. Grant.
N. Coolidge, Senr.	R. Coolidge.	S. Randall.
N. Bright.	D. Benjamin.	Jno. Stone.
J. Mason.	D. Smith.	S. Stratton
P. Wellington.	D. Fiske.	C. Coolidge
W. Bond.	E. Goddard.	J. Eddy, Junr.
T. Bond.	R. Beers.	M. Sawing.
J. Beers.	A. Benjamin.	J. Grant.
J. Eddy, Senr.	J. Coolidge.	J. Treadaway.
J. Train.	J. Dix, Senr.	T. Coolidge.
J. Bond.	G. Lawrence.	W. Shattuck.
W. Shattuck.	D. Church.	J. Maddock.
S. Jennison.	T. Whitney.	E. Whitney.
J. Stratten, Junr.	S. Hastings.	Eliz. Bond.
R. Goddard.		

The names of those, who subscribed for worship at the new meeting-house, were as follows :

J. Warren, Senr.	Jno. Mars, Junr.	B. Whitney.
S. Cook, Senr.	J. Brown.	N. Sterns.
J. Mars, Senr.	T. Phillips	J. Wellington Senr.
J. Barnard, Senr.	James Barnard]	for his land in Wa-
H. Clark, Senr.	S. Phillips.	tertown.
S. Paris.	G. Beal.	D. Harrington.
C. Church.	J. Warren, the Cap-	B. Garfield.
E. Cutter, Senr.	tain's son.	Justice Phillips.
S. Cook.	R. Bloss.	A. Gale.
Jm. Mars.		

(I, page 77.)

I have been informed, that the monument* now standing over the ashes of Mr. Gibbs and his wife, was erected by the Rev. Dr. Appleton of Cambridge, who, as has been already said, was married to their daughter. If this be true, it is probable that the following epitaphs, inscribed on the monument, were written by him.

Hic
 Depositæ sunt reliquiæ viri
 verè venerandi
 Henrici Gibbs, Ecclesiæ Christi
 apud Aquitonienses Pastoris
 vigilantissimi,
 Pietate fulgente, eruditione non
 mediocri, gravitate singulari
 spectatissimi :
 Peritiâ in divinis, prudentiâ in humanis,
 accuratone in concionibus, copiâ in precibus,
 præcellentis :
 Qui per ærumnas vitæ doloresque mortis
 requiem tandem invenit.
 die Octobris 21. Anno Domini MDCCXXIII.
 Ætatis suæ LVI.

Hic
 Etiam deponitur corpus Mercy Gibbs
 Conjugis suæ dilectissimæ,
 Quæ expiravit in Domino 24 Januariis
 Anno Domini MDCCXVI.
 Ætatis suæ XLI.

(K, page 113.)

It may be interesting to some to present, somewhat more in detail, the doings of the town on this subject. The report mentioned in the narrative, after a long preamble, recommended the following resolves :

" 1st. That we highly approve of the late resolutions of the merchants of the town of Boston, and elsewhere in this State, and also of the doings of the said town of Boston, and their proposal for calling a Convention at Concord, in the County of Middlesex, on the 14th day of this inst. July, for the purpose of de-

* This, and the monument erected to Thomas Baily, and to John Bailey's wife, were repaired and put in order in 1821.

vising ways and means for lowering the prices of all the necessary articles of life, both foreign and domestick, and for the effectually appreciating our currency. 2dly. That the town will, by their committee, meet at Concord on the 14th of July inst. for the purpose aforesaid. 3dly. That, in order to co-operate forthwith with the merchants in their glorious attempt for the lowering the prices of every necessary of life, it is resolved, that the produce of our respective farms shall not advance in price in the least degree from what they now are, upon condition the late resolution of the merchants respecting foreign articles shall continue : but the same shall lower in the same proportion as foreign articles do, — and that we will use our utmost exertions that the several mechanicks in this town lower in like proportion ; and in order that this vote be carried into complete execution, voted 4thly, That a committee of seven be chosen, whose business it shall be to ascertain, as nearly as may be, the prices of foreign and domestick articles, and to determine what proportion they ought in equity to bear each to the other, and publish their doings monthly, and cause the same to be posted up at the meeting-house and other places of publick resort in the town, which shall regulate the prices of all the articles mentioned in said notification for the time therein specified : And if any person or persons shall be so lost to all sense of honour, love of their country, or their own interest, as to violate in the least degree the true intent and meaning of this resolution, by selling their produce at a higher price than established by said committee from time to time, said person or persons so offending shall be deemed enemies to their country, and cryed as such by the town-clerk, for six months after, at every publick meeting of the town : — this resolution to hold good and valid until the State at large shall have adopted some permanent mode of regulating the same. 5thly. That the Selectmen be directed, without loss of time, to transmit copies of the proceedings of this meeting to the towns of Newton and Waltham, praying them to adopt some such method, in order that we may be mutually assisting in the only feasible way possible, that we can think of, for the appreciating our currency, and thereby rendering our independency sure, and securing to us and our posterity peace, liberty, and safety.”

On the 26th of July, 1779, the resolves passed in the Convention at Concord were accepted and approved by Watertown, and a committee was appointed “to regulate and settle the prices of such articles as may be thought proper.” This committee soon after reported a list of prices for articles, in addition to those agreed upon at Concord. “Hay and milk in Boston market”

were exempted from the regulation. The following is the list of prices, as given in the town records

"For the Innholders:—a dinner 18s.—horse-keeping per night 17s.—oats per pottle 5s.—punch per bowl 30s.—W. Ind. flip per mug 12s.—yoke of oxen per night at English hay 18s.

Tanner.

sole leather per lb. . . . 20s.
curried calf-skins, single,
equal to 6 lbs. sole leather.

Labour.

a man per day, find himself 60s.
a man per day, and found 40s.

Teaming.

per mile, not exceeding 90
miles out, per ton . . . 18s.
man and team per day, find-
ing themselves . . . £5. 10s.
man and team, found, per day £4.

Shoemaker.

men's best shoes per pair £6. 00
women's best do. " . . . 4. 10s.

Tailor.

making a man's best worked
coat £8.
do. do. waistcoat 4.
do. do. breeches 4.

Weaver.

for weaving 7-8 cotton and
linen cloth per yard 6s. 3d.
do. yard wide tow . . . 6s. 3d.
5-4 all wool 9s.

Blacksmith.

narrow axe £7. 10s.
shoeing a horse round
with refined iron and
steel £5. 00
shoeing oxen in the same
manner £10. 00

Mechanics.

per day, finding themselves 72s.
do. and found . . . 52s.

Saddler.

best saddle compleat . . . £70.
best curbed bridle . . . £12.

best single-reined do. . . £6.

Leather-dresser.

best sheep's wool per lb. 22s. 6d.
best wash'd leather dress-
ed sheep-skins, single 56s. 3d.

Boating from Boston.

per boat-load . . . £18. 15s.
per hogshead . . . 25s.
per barrell 7s. 6d.

Barber.

shaving 3s.

Hatter.

best beaver hat . . . £40.
best felt hat £4.

Joiner.

common mahogany desk £ 20.
do. round top case drawers £130.
do. four foot table . . . £ 27.

Currier.

currying calf-skins . . . 24s.
do. a hide £4.

Tallow-Chandler.

candles per lb. . . . 18s.
hard soap per lb. . . . 10s.
soap per barrell . . . £15.

Potter.

quart mugs per doz. . . 50s.
do. single 5s.

Butcher.

raw hides per lb. . . . 3s.
best tallow per lb. . . . 9s.

flax per lb. . . . 12s.
milk per quart 2s.
oats per bushel . . . 48s.
barley per bushel . . . £4. 10s.
malt per bushel . . . £4. 10s.

Horse-hire per mile 5s. Chaise-hire per mile 5s. All articles of European manufactures at the same rates, that shall be affixed to them by the town of Boston."

A committee was likewise chosen to carry into effectual and rigid execution the proceedings of the Convention at Concord.

(L, page 125.)

It may not be without use to subjoin to our annals a brief account of the town, as it is at the present time.

Watertown is $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Boston, and is bounded on the north by West Cambridge, on the east by Cambridge, on the south by Charles River and by Newton, and on the west by Waltham. It is pleasantly situated on Charles River, which in its beautiful windings decorates the scenery, at the same time that it confers more substantial advantages. In extent of territory, Watertown is one of the smallest towns in Massachusetts, containing only $3833\frac{6}{10}$ acres, including land and water, as will appear from the following result of a survey taken by Mr. John G. Hales of Boston :

Half of Charles River, length 375 chains,	
by 2 chains wide	- - - 75 acres.
Part of Fresh Pond	- - - $58\frac{5}{10}$
Small stream and Mill-pond	- - - 3
	<hr/> 136 $\frac{5}{10}$
Amount of land, including roads &c.	3697 $\frac{1}{10}$
	<hr/>
Whole contents within the lines	- 3833 $\frac{6}{10}$

The soil of Watertown is in general remarkably good. A portion of the southeastern extremity of the town is sandy, poor, and barren ; but, with this exception, the land is among the best and most productive in the Commonwealth. The soil consists, for the most part, of black loam, having a substratum of hard earth, so that it suffers but little comparatively from drought in summer. There is very little wood-land in the town, nearly all

the soil being cleared and cultivated. A large proportion of the inhabitants, comprising nearly all those who occupy the north part of the town, are employed in agriculture, and their farms are under very good cultivation. The usual productions of the villages in the vicinity of Boston are found here in abundance, and a large supply is furnished for the market of the city. There are a few country seats, beautifully situated, and in a state of high and improved cultivation.

A branch of business, which has been of considerable importance in Watertown, is the fishery of Charles River. It is annually let out by the town for the highest sum that can be obtained. Several years ago, it produced a revenue of between 600 and 800 dollars a year; now it is much less profitable, being commonly let out for 250 or 300 dollars a year. The shad fishery is the only one of much value; and the number of that kind of fish taken in the river is considerably less, than it was 40 or 50 years since. If we go further back, the contrast is still greater. Wood, describing Watertown about 150 years ago, speaks of "the great store of shads and alewives," and then says, that "the inhabitants in two tides have gotten one hundred thousand of these fishes." *New England's Prospect*, p. 46.*

There are two paper-mills in the town; at one of them, only brown paper is made; at the other, besides brown paper they make printing paper, candle paper, glass paper, &c. Each of these mills manufactures, on an average, 150 reams per week. There are also two manufactories of cloth. "The Watertown Woollen Factory Company" has an establishment near the bridge; this manufactures broadcloths and cassimeres, employs from 30 to 35 hands, and turns out about 250 yards per week. "The Bemis Manufacturing Company" (incorporated in 1827) has a much larger establishment about a mile above the bridge; this consists of two factories, a Woollen Factory, which manufactures about 2500 yards of satinet per week, and a Cotton Factory, which spins and warps for satinets, and makes about 2000 bolts of cotten duck per annum.

The town has four public schools. Two of these are kept the whole year, one by a male teacher, the other by a female. The other two are taught by masters in the winter, and by female teachers in the summer. The number of children in all these schools is, on an average, about 240. There is one flourishing

* After some litigation, the profits of the fishery are now divided between Watertown and Brighton, the proportion of seven tenths to the former and three tenths to the latter town.

private school in the town ; and there are two or three, at which reading and spelling are taught to little children. In December, 1829, a Lyceum was established, at a meeting of the inhabitants called for that purpose, and a course of lectures was given, which lasted till the end of April ; by a regulation of the society, the lectures or other exercises are to continue for six months from the 1st of November, being suspended during the summer months. Connected with the Lyceum is a scientific and miscellaneous library ; there are two libraries besides this, one a Religious Library, the other a Juvenile Library, to which all the children in the town have access.

There are three meeting-houses within the limits of the town ; one for Congregationalists, one for Universalists, and one for Baptists.

The number of inhabitants has not increased so rapidly in Watertown, as in many other places. There has been, however, a gradual increase. The following statements exhibit, I believe, the most complete account that can be had of the population of Watertown at different periods. All these, except the census taken the present year, were collected and furnished to me by the Rev. Dr. Freeman, Senior Pastor of King's Chapel, Boston, a name which cannot be mentioned without the remembrance of highly valued services in the cause of pure and rational religion, and of an old age ripe in wisdom and in Christian virtue.

Number of Negro Slaves in 1754
of sixteen years and upwards :

Males	7
Females	5
	<hr/> 12

See Coll. of Mass. Hist. Soc. 2d
Series, vol. III. p. 95.

*Census ordered in 1763 and taken
in 1764.*

No. of houses	103
No. of families	117
	<hr/>
No. of males under 16	172
No. of females under 16	136
No. of males above 16	179
No. of females above 16	195
No. of negroes	11
	<hr/>

Whole number of souls 693

Census taken March, 1776.

No. of whites	1057
---------------	------

Census of 1777.

No. of males of 16 and up- wards	185
Strangers	21
Blacks	1

Valuation of 1778.

No. of Polls	210
--------------	-----

Valuation of 1781.

No of Polls	222
-------------	-----

Census of 1783.

No. of whites	771
No. of blacks	9

Number of souls 780

Valuation of 1784.

No. of Polls	256
Supported by the town	3

Census of 1790

No. of families	164
-----------------	-----

Free white males, of 16 and upwards	319
do. under 16	250
Free white females	511
All other free persons	11

Total 1091

Census of 1800.

Free white males under 10 years	184
do. of 10 and under 16	96
do. of 16 and under 26	133
do. of 26 and under 45	113
do. of 45 and upwards	87
Free white females under 10 years	196
do. of 10 and under 16	83
do. of 16 and under 26	101
do. of 26 and under 45	116
do. of 45 and upwards	93
Other free persons, except Indians not taxed. . . .	5

Total 1207

Census of 1810.

Free white males under 10 years	199
do. of 10 and under 16	96
do. of 16 and under 26	236
do. of 26 and under 45	166
do. of 45 and upwards	91
Free white females under 10 years	190
do. of 10 and under 16	129
do. of 16 and under 26	176
do. of 26 and under 45	145
do. of 45 and upwards	94
Other free persons, except Indians not taxed	9

Total 1531

Census of 1820.

Free white males under 10 years of age	213
do. of 10 and under 16	102
do. of 16 and under 26	178
do. of 26 and under 45	192
do. of 45 and upwards	98

Free white females under 10 years	166
do. of 10 and under 16	116
do. of 16 and under 26	177
do. of 26 and under 45	165
do. of 45 and upwards	102

Foreigners not naturalized	57
Persons engaged in agriculture	145
Persons engaged in commerce	13
Persons engaged in manufactures	179

Free colored males under 14 years	0
do. of 14 and under 26	1
do. of 26 and under 45	2
do. of 45 and upwards	2
Free colored females under 14 years	1
do. of 14 and under 26	2
do. of 26 and under 45	1
do. of 45 and upwards	0

Total 1518

Census of 1830.

Number of males under 5 years	101
do. between 5 and 10	94
do. between 10 and 15	75
do. between 15 and 20	86
do. between 20 and 30	216
do. between 30 and 40	100
do. between 40 and 50	64
do. between 50 and 60	35
do. between 60 and 70	25
do. between 70 and 80	15

Number of females under 5 years	100
do. between 5 and 10	100
do. between 10 and 15	80
do. between 15 and 20	98
do. between 20 and 30	177
do. between 30 and 40	111
do. between 40 and 50	52
do. between 50 and 60	50
do. between 60 and 70	35
do. between 70 and 80	14
do. between 80 and 90	8
do. between 90 & 100	1

Number of colored males		Number of colored fe-	
under 10 years	3	males under 10 years	2
do between 24 and 36	1	do. between 10 and 24	3
do. between 36 and 55	1	do. between 24 and 30	1
			<hr/>
		Total	1643

In addition to the above statements of population, it should be mentioned, that, in the book of church records kept by the Rev. Mr. Angier, and mentioned in the course of the preceding narrative, there is found the following notice, viz., "180 families in Watertown in April, 1733." This seems a much larger number of families, than might be expected at so early a period; but it should be remembered, that this was before Waltham was separated from Watertown, and that consequently the families in both towns were included in the estimate.

Within a few years two new roads from Watertown to Boston have been constructed and opened. One runs to Cambridge Port and West Boston Bridge, and was finished in 1824, but not opened till 1825. The other furnishes a passage to Boston over the Western Avenue, or the Mill Dam (as it is sometimes called), and was finished and opened in 1824. The latter road takes nearly the same direction with one, which many years ago was projected by the Rev. Mr. Eliot and others, but which at that time failed of being accomplished, from unfavorable circumstances, or because the plan was premature. Almost all the travel through and from Watertown to Boston is now performed on these new roads, the old road through Cambridge being much less used than formerly.

Until a recent period, it was the custom to support the town's poor by placing them at board, wherever the cheapest terms could be obtained; but within a few years, buildings have been purchased in the town for an almshouse, to which is annexed a farm of good land. All the poor supported by the town are now placed there. The establishment is under the care of overseers appointed by the town, and is well and carefully regulated.

END.



